THE ENGLISH TRADITION OF EDUCATION

THE ENGLISH TRADITION OF EDUCATION

BY
CYRIL NORWOOD, M.A., D.LIT.
HEADMASTER OF HARROW SCHOOL

WITHDRAWN
UTSA Libraries

NEW YORK
E. P. DUTTON AND COMPANY INC.

1930

PREFACE

IF this book is of any value, it will only be because it is a statement of faith and hope by one who has had experience of more than one side of English education, and is still actively engaged in the work.

No reference is made to the education of girls, and the omission is deliberate. But the writer is well aware that to both sexes the ideal is common, and that to its interpretation women will make increasingly rich contribution. Much that he has written is by no means limited in its reference to boys' schools only.

CONTENTS

PART I

IDEALS

CHAP.		PAGE
I	Some Preliminary Thoughts	3
II	The Origin of the English Tradition	8
III	Religion	21
IV	Religion (*contd.*)	35
V	Religion (*contd.*)	49
VI	Discipline	61
VII	Culture	80
VIII	Athletics	95
IX	Service	110

PART II

THE SCHOOLS AS THEY ARE

X	Secondary Boarding-Schools	129
XI	Secondary Day-Schools	149
XII	Elementary Education—The Training of a Nation	168
XIII	The Danger from Mechanization	188
XIV	The Danger from Misrepresentation	210
XV	The Danger from Individualism	225

PART III

THINGS THAT MAY BE

CHAP.		PAGE
XVI	Democracy and Knowledge . . .	243
XVII	What are the Prospects? . . .	261
XVIII	What are the Prospects? (*contd.*) . .	279
XIX	"My Mind to Me a Kingdom is" . .	298
XX	Europe or America: or is it Europe and America?	317
	Index	337

PART I

IDEALS

CHAPTER I

SOME PRELIMINARY THOUGHTS

THE practical man who theorizes is seldom accounted wise by his own generation, or, for that matter, by any other, and the Headmaster who theorizes may be a conspicuous example of the truth of the saying. Thring is remembered as the creator of Uppingham, but not as the author of *Education and School*, which no one would buy, nor yet as the writer of the *Theory and Practice of Teaching*, for which he did indeed receive fifty pounds. Headmasters cannot even write novels about school life, for it is generally agreed that to this poor branch of literature their contributions have been the worst. They are men of action who should forswear the pen. If then I venture to tread where many predecessors have fallen, I do so because, like all authors, I have something which I want at this present time to say, and, since it belongs neither to the realms of imagination nor to the province of pure theory, I hope that even an active Headmaster may not be wholly ineffective in stating it.

My thesis is very simple. It is merely that we have a great national tradition of education,

and that we are in danger of neglecting it, of permitting its structure to be impaired, and its foundations to be shaken. It was not in its origin based on a logical theory, nor is it the creation of any inspired educational reformer. It has merely grown out of the life of the nation, and therefore to those who are born within that nation it seems commonplace. It is taken to be something which everybody knows. Those who wish to seem original, pioneers in matters of education, and leaders of advance, are apt to borrow the authority of a foreign name to commend reform, and the frequency with which the names of Pestalozzi and Froebel, Herbart and Freud, Montessori and Dalton have been at various periods bandied to and fro might lead one to think that the English themselves have created nothing worthy of note. There are, moreover, the clever writers, young and old, who capture their market by deriding what is commonplace and ridiculing what is accepted, and, since education is at all times apt to be a region of accepted commonplaces, the reasons for which may have been forgotten, since moreover it is a region in which practice is apt to fall most painfully short of theory, it offers a very favourable field for the exercise of wit and satire. Advantage of this fact has been so frequently taken that experience has taught us the truth of the melancholy paradox, that there is nothing quite so stupid as a very clever young man writing about education.

An additional reason for our national habit of

treating what is native as uninspired, and honouring the exotic, at any rate with our lips, is that the practitioners in the field of education are for the most part inarticulate, and in a good many cases, even by the standards of practice, not very successful exponents of the art which they profess. Theirs not to reason why, theirs but to teach, and die. In this long-drawn-out process it must be allowed that they offer a target, and we must not grumble if the arrows of criticism fly towards it, nor repine if some of them make a palpable hit.

There must, however, be something in this national tradition of education, for it stood the strain of the War, and emerged very much the stronger from the ordeal, as a system which had been tried in the furnace, and had not been found wanting. Before 1914 it was almost usual to hear it said without contradiction that such system as might exist in this country could not compare for efficiency or results with that of Germany, where industry never failed, and all was designed to lead up to a well-thought-out end. It is a fact which makes an odd comment on these generalizations, once so familiar, that it is Germany, and not England, that is reconsidering its educational ideals, and that it is to English schools that the Germans are turning to learn a secret which may have eluded them. That English tradition not only carried the country through the War, but to it we owe our acquisition, maintenance, and development of our

present Empire, to it we owe the fact that is of vital import for the future of humanity, that in essence it is not an Empire of conquest and exploitation, but of trusteeship, development, and growth. It is free to change, to cast off the old, and to seek the new.

This educational tradition is not, as is sometimes said, the monopoly of a class. It may have grown up in the schools to which the sons of the privileged resort, but it is not, and it cannot be, confined to them. It is the common inheritance of all English schools that are free to live a life of their own, and it is steadily spreading from school to school. But its ideals cannot thrive unless the schools have that liberty, and that measure of independence, which give them an individual soul.

We stand on the threshold of an age of great achievement, which nothing can prevent from coming to pass save the warfare of nations and social classes. International war and social war can only be stopped by an education that is both general and thorough : education alone can give to the whole nation that poise and sympathy which will make possible a more real social justice. Ignorance engenders the hatred that grows between class and class : education can create a nation that is in truth one. Before that nation, if it can be brought to birth, lies the opportunity of being one of the leaders, if not the chief leader, in the task of making international peace secure, and warfare a memory, in the task of advancing with

the United States of America and the great countries of Europe towards a system which may become the United States of the world, in the task of giving to the backward and undeveloped races their due place and their due opportunity. Powers as yet unconceived await the humanity that may be born.

The nation which is called to these tasks is an unlimited democracy, and of the same type is that nation across the Atlantic which will be its most powerful partner: for unless both peoples set themselves to the work as partners in the same spirit, that work cannot be accomplished. It is certain that an ignorant democracy must fail, and at present the most that we can claim is that in Britain or in the United States it is half-educated and no more. Time is short, and there is no standing still. But an educated democracy will succeed, if by that we mean a democracy so educated in every type of school that it will answer to the call of the same ideals, and accept the same standards of conduct and service. It is because in that tradition of education which I have called English I feel that we have ready to our hand the instrument that can create the educated democracy, upon which the whole future depends, that I have ventured to write this book.

CHAPTER II

THE ORIGIN OF THE ENGLISH TRADITION

IT is no part of my intention to attempt a history of English education, for that can be studied by the curious in the appropriate works of reference. But it is necessary to my argument to review briefly the origin of the tradition, and to observe how far back in the stream of our national history it can be observed. English education is like the English political system. Its institutions change, and adapt themselves, but maintain their identity from century to century: the Universities of the early Middle Ages are recognizable as not entirely distinct and different from the Oxford and Cambridge of to-day, and there are schools still flourishing which can claim a still more venerable antiquity. It is not necessary to carry research far to find existent in the earliest days the great fundamental ideals of the formation of character and the duty of service which have marked all that is best in our national effort. In the best periods these have been strongly marked, and in the worst days they have never been entirely forgotten.

It seems a far cry to return to the remote and

dimly-seen figure of the great Alfred, but it is not too far to recognize in outline the true vision which sees in education that single system which prepares citizens to serve a united nation. Alfred's task was to lead an illiterate people against an alien race of invaders in a divided and backward country, and the struggle for existence occupied most of his days. But he saw that his folk needed most of all leaders. He borrowed teachers from abroad: he caused the best textbooks of the age to be translated: he founded schools, and sent to them the sons of his leading men. He sought to develop the use and knowledge of the native tongue, and it is probable that he looked forward to a time when in days of more assured peace the system could be extended, and the son of every freeman would be able to read and write. In other words, his principles were that the State or the Church has the right to the service of the best brains of the community, and that the whole body of the people, and not merely one particular class, ought to have a common culture and a common outlook.

Centuries had to elapse before those ideals could come to be realized even in a rudimentary form, but the light which Alfred kindled was never entirely put out. The Norman Conquest came and passed, and the nation slowly formed itself into a unity from its Saxon, Danish and Norman elements. Slowly and simultaneously it built up a system of education. Its purpose was to produce knights and clerks, on the one

hand soldiers and administrators of great feudal estates, on the other statesmen, clergy great and small, and accountants. For the knight there was the school of chivalry, the long apprenticeship to riding and the use of arms, to hunting and open-air sport, to the tilt-yard and the realities of warfare, but behind all this and inspiring it all was a great moral ideal of conduct. "To ride abroad, redressing human wrongs," to serve one lady in all purity and fidelity, these were noble ideals: it is with a smile or a sneer, according to our disposition, that we dismiss them when we remember the bloody facts of mediaeval history. It was with a sad smile that Cervantes seemed finally to bid them farewell in his great romance. But he dismissed them only in the elaborate, artificial and insincere form which they had assumed. The ideal of physical fitness and bodily prowess, beauty and the service of beauty, courage and self-sacrifice, honour and honesty, remained to inspire all that was noblest under the Tudors, to mould and produce a Sir Philip Sidney. It passed on into a more prosaic age, but it slowly shaped the ideal of the English gentleman. The troubled seventeenth century has many figures to show for whom conduct and service were the guiding stars of their destiny, a Hampden and a Falkland, for instance, and, if the prosaic eighteenth century seemed to degrade the type too frequently to the stupidities of mere field-sports, gluttony, and gambling, yet it recovered in the nineteenth to inspire Arnold with his ideal of the

Christian gentleman, and to produce what is noblest in the schools of to-day.

This ideal of knighthood and chivalry, often corrupted but never completely perverted, worked mainly outside the schools: it was the purpose of the schools themselves to produce the clerks, and its instrument was the international language of mediaeval Latin. But the schools in the Middle Ages were not mere grammar-grinding institutions, whatever they may have become later, and what they were meant to be can best be studied in the foundation of Winchester College by William of Wykeham in 1382. He meant it to be, first, a place of preparation for further study, and therefore founded it in close connection with New College, Oxford. It was to be, secondly, a place in which the older helped the younger, and he designed a rudimentary prefect system: it was his expressed purpose that eighteen of the most advanced boys should both exercise control and give instruction. Thirdly, the life lived was to be corporate, and this was to extend both to work and to play. That corporate life was to be shaped and inspired by an ideal of character, the formation of which was to be the main object of the education given, and he expressed this in the famous motto that "Manners makyth man." Fourthly, he contemplated a mixture of classes, and a career opened to talent of whatever origin. Winchester was to consist of poor scholars and choristers, and also of the sons of nobility and gentry, who would pay for

the education which they would obtain. Winchester inspired many other foundations, and here in embryo is the ideal of the English public-school system, which has through dark and evil days somehow managed to survive through the centuries.

At the end of the Middle Ages in this country there was, therefore, in existence, or coming into existence, an education which was in spirit national. The unity of Church and State was not yet broken. The sons of the nobility were, for the most part, privately trained, but in accordance with a definite ideal of public service. There existed all over the country schools in considerable abundance, in which the sons of yeomen and merchants, and what we should call generally the middle class, could acquire the learning which, primarily through the service of the Church, would open to them, too, an avenue to public service. From these came the administrators, civil servants, and some of the statesmen: Wolsey, it will be remembered, was the son of a butcher. The system had unity, and it possessed, and on the whole honoured, ideals. But it no sooner began to form itself into a coherent whole than it broke up.

The Renaissance and the Reformation were both disintegrating influences. The Renaissance by itself might have been an inspiration, for it brought in a more living curriculum, and more valuable subjects of study. But it also brought with it much individualism, and questioned the principles of the old loyalties to Church and

State. It was the Reformation which in this country dealt the hardest blow to education. It broke up the unity of the nation. The Catholics were outlawed and persecuted, and the Protestants broke into sects. Many schools were plundered and destroyed, and a spirit of self-seeking, of private profit to be made at the expense of the public benefit, was let loose. By the end of the reign of Elizabeth, many of the schools were refounded, but in a different spirit, with smaller resources, and with less opportunity. They were for one class, the sons of the members of the Established Church. There was no access for the sons of Catholics or Nonconformists. The old ideals were lost sight of, and the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries are a dark period in the history of English education. A Milton or a Locke might theorize about education, but the inside of the schools of the nation was given over to a narrow curriculum of much Latin and a little Greek, handled with increasing stupidity by clerical pedagogues of low status. Many seem to have had no higher ideals than to teach grammar and repetition with the aid of the birch. Their pay was a pittance, their classes impossibly large, and they left the boys to shape their own characters. Here and there "*rari nantes in gurgite vasto*" were nobler spirits, but the nation as a whole was surrendered to a hard and fast system of privilege, to the government of a political oligarchy, and to a system of thought in which spiritual values had been largely forgotten.

When we come to the opening of the nineteenth century, when the world had felt the forces of the French Revolution, and the movement for reform was gathering force in this country, we find the Universities torpid, a close preserve in which the rich were allowed to idle, and scholars and sizars to work, so long as they kept in their places, but in which nevertheless there was beginning a certain stir and movement. They were barred and shut against Catholics and Nonconformists, who had indeed to provide the whole of their own education for themselves. The Nonconformists had built up in the eighteenth century a number of flourishing academies, but these were now in decay: their education, such as it was, was being carried on in short-lived private schools of varying merit. The Catholics were privately educated at home, and sought their Universities abroad. In both classes the experience of youth and early manhood must have brought a sense of embitterment against the State. The established system of secondary education, if it can so be called, was a network of schools dominated by the Church of England, and imperfectly distributed, nearly all of them in a state of decline. The boys in attendance at the old public schools, which were themselves not many in number, amounted all told to very few and none of the grammar schools contained more than a handful. The mass of the nation's children, even of the upper and middle classes, must have been either privately educated in one way or another, or

not educated at all, and when one considers the state of the schools and the conditions of travel, one cannot criticize the parents for not taking advantage of what was often in effect something rather worse than nothing.

However, the French Revolution spread its leaven abroad, and reform was in the air. The industrial system was taking shape, and railways were being built. Wealth was increasing, and was becoming more widely distributed. Oriel was full of its clever young Dons, the Noetics. Liberalism was alarming Newman. It was at this moment of critical development and change that Arnold became Headmaster of Rugby, and the process began which in a generation changed the whole spirit, tone, and outlook of the schools.

For a long time it was the habit to ascribe everything in the modern public-school system to Arnold, and of late it has been customary to pass to the opposite extreme, and to describe him as a myth, at best a puzzled person who put into practice the ideas that were current everywhere in his day, but who had the luck to impose himself upon posterity. This theory is a natural reaction from the uncritical adulation of all Arnold's work, but it is a travesty of the facts. It is certain that Arnold created the prefect system in the sense that he made it the instrument by which he governed the school, and in so doing laid upon the senior boys a direct, and indeed an extreme moral, obligation. The prefects who had always existed at Winchester had long been a shadow

of what they were meant to be, and of what they later became: Arnold had himself been one of them, and it would be interesting to know what would have been the attitude of Arnold the Headmaster of Rugby to the delinquencies of Arnold the prefect of Winchester. It is certain that he began the process of widening the curriculum, not merely because he introduced into it French and mathematics, but because he taught in a new spirit, and expected and received greater industry and greater intelligence. It is certain that he was the first Headmaster of Rugby who was appointed chaplain, and I believe that he was the first Headmaster who definitely regarded himself as standing in the spiritual relation of pastor to his boys.

An examination of the state of the other great schools at the period when Arnold began to be Headmaster of Rugby will show that not one of his reforms was being attempted, and nothing of his spirit was being shown. A little later, and his methods were being tried everywhere. The oldest schools were indeed the last to learn, but Harrow was changed by Vaughan, one of Arnold's pupils, and it was Arnold's masters and pupils who carried his method and his spirit into school after school, new foundations and old, schools for boarders and schools for day-boys. It would be interesting, but not worth while, to trace the ramifications of this vitalizing process in detail. If one is inquiring into the origins of a system, and finds no trace of it before a certain vigorous

personality is placed in a position of authority and influence, if at a shortly later period you find that system being universally adopted, you are not likely to be far wrong in ascribing the change to the personality, even if there are points in the personality which you do not like, and even if you belong yourself to another school than that of which he was Headmaster. It was written in one of Arnold's testimonials that, if he were appointed, he would change the face of education in England: it was a bold claim to make for an untried man, but it proved true in substance and in fact.

This, however, is by no means meant as an assertion of any claim that when Arnold died the system was perfect, and that no contribution came from other sources. The religion which he taught to his pupils was a Liberal Protestantism, but it was more Protestant than Liberal, and it was strongly coloured by Puritanism. The practical points of the religion which he impressed were uprightness, honour, and industry, and in relation to Church and State, the duty of honest service. He was himself a great commanding officer, but to the average boy in his school he must have appeared remote. "His whole method," says Dean Stanley, "was founded on the principle of awakening the intellect of every individual boy." It is strongly to be suspected that this means "every individual boy who succeeded in reaching the Sixth Form," and so coming under Arnold's personal influence. Arnold did not indeed break

down, or seek to break down, the aloofness which existed between boys and masters. The whole world of art, music, and drama remained outside his province. Nor is there any proof that he saw in games anything other than a harmless way of spending a period of relaxation from work: he did not perceive the power of games in the building of character.

The system has been enriched by the life-work of many able men, and of a few who deserve the title of great: to trace their work in detail would be to write the history of education in the nineteenth century. Perhaps the most original of these labourers in the educational vineyard has been Thring. He can claim to have made good his belief that every individual boy has something to contribute, and that it is the business of the school to find what it is, and to help him to bring it to birth. He can claim to have seen the value of music, and to have realized the bad effect of ugly surroundings, and the necessity of making educational buildings suitable for their purpose. He acted always up to his belief that a Headmaster should know every individual boy. He took an interest in method, and in teaching as an art. There have throughout the nineteenth and into the present century been many varieties worked out by original men, all from the central theme. Almond of Loretto was a rebel who worked first, and a long way first, for character and physique, then for intelligence and manners, last for information. Howson of Holt and San-

derson of Oundle felt themselves to be rebels in other ways, breaking away from public-school conventionalism, relying upon modern subjects, and using new methods of discipline and teaching. Meantime other men working on the accepted lines did great work for individual schools, like Vaughan at Harrow, Bradley at Marlborough, Temple at Rugby, or Percival at Clifton. And little by little, in spite of the innate conservatism of boys and their masters, and the tendency of the successful methods of one generation to harden into a tradition, cramping that which comes next, the schools have continued to absorb new ideas, and the tradition has never become fixed or dead.

For what has happened in the course of the last hundred years is that the old ideals have been recaptured. The ideal of chivalry which inspired the knighthood of mediaeval days, the ideal of training for the service of the community, which inspired the greatest of the men who founded schools for their own day and for posterity, have been combined in the tradition of English education which holds the field to-day. It is based upon religion: it relies largely upon games and open-air prowess, where these involve corporate effort: it has developed an intellectual appeal on many sides which is meant to promote the growth of many diverse gifts: it has cast its Puritanism, and has no longer any fear of art, or music, or even the drama. It is inspired by the duty of preparing all for the service of their generation. It is by no means now the private monopoly of a

few privileged schools, and it ought to spread fast to all the schools of the country.

I propose, therefore, to examine in closer detail the various factors which make up this English ideal, and then to consider with frankness the failure of existing schools to come up to the ideal which they seek. In the light of that examination I shall point out the dangers to the hitherto accepted ideal which arise from certain modern tendencies, and seek to find how far and in what way it can be extended to inspire all the schools of the country of whatever class. For the object of all who labour in the service of their country's education should surely be to unite the whole teaching profession in a single aim, and to break down the barriers that divide. Nothing can unite men more than to seek the same end with a frank recognition of comradeship in the search, and the object of this preliminary chapter has been to endeavour to show that the ideal which the public schools are seeking, however imperfectly, is the true ideal, that it answers to our national needs, and has its roots far back in our national history.

CHAPTER III

RELIGION

THE first and the most important element in the ideal of a great school, that which is the foundation for all the rest, is religion. It has always been so in the highest education of our country; and the greatest problem of the future is how to bring it about that a definite religion moved by a single spirit, whatever the varieties of interpretation it can legitimately permit within itself, shall inspire the education of the nation that is to be. Yet gibes are made against every part of school religion: in the elementary school it is derided as Cowper-Templeism, or Birreligion, or as the unmeaning residuum of all the faiths, a common denominator of indifference: in the secondary school it is declared to be non-existent, at most the supposed topic of a wasted period on Monday, which is usually devoted to a more paying purpose: in the boarding-school it is referred to as Public School Religion, the lip-service of compulsion, parade without sincerity, at best an ornamental sham, and at worst a blasphemy. Once the topic is started, old boys remember all sorts of funny stories, now about Chapel, and now about Con-

firmation, and now about a Scripture lesson. Those who take all this at its face-value are not surprised that the colleges of the Universities for the most part accept with resignation the fact that their chapels are empty.

Yet the truth is that much earnest work, and much anxious thought, are devoted to the purpose of making religion real and vital in the life of the schools. It is right that it should be so, for the whole problem is fundamental, and demands our full and honest consideration. There are at least five ways by which the value and meaning of religion can be impressed upon boys, and all of them are in habitual use. They are the services of the School Chapel, attendance at Holy Communion, together with the teaching and belief connected with it, Confirmation and the preparation for it, Scripture teaching and the use of the Bible, and finally Voluntary Services and Societies. There is also that which is more effective than any of these, namely, personal example, of which something can be said in its place. For the present it would be well to begin with a consideration of the five ways of approach, and to consider their success or ill-success, their defects, and their dangers, if such there be.

All the great boarding-schools have their chapels, and some of them are very glorious buildings. The more glorious they are the better, for more boys are brought to a sense of God by the wonder and the quickened sense of beauty which noble architecture creates than a good many people

think. Boys do not wear their hearts on their sleeves, and those who do not know them think them insensitive, dull, dead to higher issues. It is not so. The modern Carthusian may refer to his grand new chapel as a Zeppelin shed, but that does not mean that he does not perceive its beauty and its meaning. An ugly chapel which is pushed away into one corner of the buildings, or a temporary room which is used as a makeshift, are a handicap to religion, particularly if the rest of the school accommodation is good. Even young boys reason subconsciously from their surroundings, and it is natural to draw the incorrect inference that if a bad setting is good enough, religion does not matter. Part of the failure of nineteenth-century religion, not only in the Church but still more among the Nonconformists, was due to the tolerated ugliness, discomfort, and even squalor, of buildings set apart for the service of God.

In these chapels there are regular services attended by the whole school: they generally occur daily, and there are always two services on Sunday. Much trouble is, as a rule, taken over them, that the music should be good, the singing worthy and reverent, the reading clear and natural. Objection is taken to them by many on the ground that these services are compulsory, and that there are too many of them: they allege always the instance of the young man who says that he was made to go to church so often when he was a schoolboy that he has no intention of going again

if he can help it. This young man is usually mythical, but he may have been produced by the schools which had fourteen compulsory services a week, half of them before breakfast, and none of them very carefully rendered. Even so, I think that the objection to compulsion is an idle one, put into boys' heads by their elders. One quality which boys in the mass never lack is common sense and reasonableness. They know that the whole of school-life is based on compulsion, or can be so described, and that they are at school to live an ordered life. They do not regard attendance at chapel as compulsory any more than attendance in the class-room at certain hours: it is what they are at school for. Of course, if you make chapel voluntary, you may be sure that you will always have a sufficient congregation: the boys will see to that, lest so valuable a relaxation should be taken away from them. Similarly, if you made attendance in the laboratories voluntary, you would again find that you always had some present. But it would be found, if you only had the power to know all the truth, that they are volunteers on the surface only: they would be there in a sacrificial spirit for the common good and obeying a compulsion none the less real and strong because unseen by the enthusiastic master.

The services of a school should be dignified by good reading, good singing, and good music, and it is essential to their spirit that they should be the services of the whole school. They are the

praise and worship of the whole community rendered to God, and therefore every boy must have the opportunity to take part; he must be encouraged to have a pride in taking his part well. That means that the whole school should make the responses, and repeat some prayers, and that they should all sing the psalms and the hymns with as much vigour and heartiness as you like, so long as they are reverent and interpret the spirit of what they are singing: it is well too, I think, that boys should read the lessons. Such a service is to some a great inspiration: they are carried out of themselves on the tide of the common effort. At any rate they forget self, and acquire a sense of beauty and power: some are carried further, and feel themselves a part in the praise ascending to God. But to others it is a parade, and they will always find plenty of opportunity for alleging that it is an insincere parade. These are, I believe, few, often those rarer spirits for whom religion and the approach to God are matters of their own chamber and their own privacy. Not many who hear a Public School service, well rendered, with the whole school joining in, can feel that it is other than an uplifting experience. Those of older years who are privileged to take part in such services, and at other times attend the services of the average church, know well the lamentable difference.

Chapel services, then, can be, and usually are, a great help, often all the greater because un-

consciously felt. But they cease to be a help, and begin to do positive harm, so soon as their discipline becomes slack, and their rendering is allowed to be unworthy. If boys lounge and take obviously no part in the proceedings, if they talk and whisper, if they shout the tunes which they like and leave unpopular chants to the choir, if there is one, or to nobody, if there is none, if they ignore the responses and the Lord's Prayer, then such services cannot but do harm to the cause of true religion in a school. There are, however, very few schools of which this is true, and many of which the reverse can be stated with confidence, just as there are very few schools which are still so foolish as to herd their boys into chapel after First School and before breakfast, and think that the wretched victims are in a fit condition either to sing or to pray.

One of the difficulties of school religion, though it is not confined to schools, and does greater mischief outside the schools than in them, is the contempt that has been poured on Mattins by one party in the Church. The assumption, implicit with some, but expressed by others, is that if you attend a Choral Eucharist at 11 a.m. your religion is real and vital, but if you attend Mattins at the same time, it is conventional and unmeaning. There is much to be said on this topic which raises issues from which I do not propose to shrink later. But it is very doubtful whether a Choral Eucharist is a fit service for a congregation which is there by compulsion, and not less doubt-

ful whether boys should be trained to attend such a service when they do not communicate. It is, I think, quite certain that such a service is intolerable when it is not perfectly sung, and rendered to the best music, and that is a standard which is beyond the powers of the average school. Rendered as I have heard it rendered, it is simply a profanation of holy things. Meantime for boys and for most laymen there is nothing wrong with Mattins if the service is interpreted with reverence and respect, and for ordinary English boys it is the right service for Sunday morning.

When all is said and done, perhaps the instrument of greatest power in the School Chapel is the sermon. There should be one sermon a week, and infinite pains should be taken with it. The congregation, it is true, is very critical, but it is also receptive: the difficulties of preaching to it are very great, for it contains young children and young men and all sorts of ages in between, masters again of all ages and habits of mind, wives, daughters, and visitors. None the less the opportunity is tremendous for those who can use it, and the records of lives which have been shaped and inspired by what was heard from the school pulpit are both many and true. A school congregation is one to which no one must preach down: for as soon as boys feel that the preacher is condescending to their level, or talking to them in the language of games on the theory that this is what they understand, and are interested in, they either shut up their ears, and retire into the

long, long thoughts of boyhood, or they listen in order to make fun afterwards. But it is astonishing how, even if a preacher has been apparently above the heads of boy-auditors, so long as he has been eloquent and clear, they gather the gist of his meaning. For they have not heard and understood many sermons, and they are fresh, thoroughly alive, and interested. They will go away afterwards, argue about what they have heard, and discuss it. Some of them will inwardly digest.

Probably those who can best preach to boys are those who live among them, their own Headmasters, who speak with the advantage of authority, their own Housemasters and School Chaplains. That this should be so, is natural, and the names of Headmasters who have been great preachers to boys is now a long one, from Arnold who began the list, to Vaughan, Temple, Percival, Wilson, Welldon, and many more. But the opportunity of the man who is sometimes belittled as the Distinguished Visitor must not be disregarded. It is true that a succession of eloquent prophets week by week, who have none of them the least idea of what their predecessor has said, may lead to a little confusion, and in the multitude of preachers all independently advising the boys to take Holy Orders there may be wisdom, but not the best method of securing their object. All this may be said, and yet a man who speaks from his own direct experience, who tells the lesson of his life and work at home

or abroad, may be profoundly moving, and a school is not wise which shuts the stranger from its gates.

Boys are not ready for any but the simplest doctrinal teaching: they do not understand it, and are not interested by it. Their problems are problems of conduct, their minds nebulous and changing, a field in which ideals are beginning to gather and to take shape. For that reason their own masters, if they understand their boys, are far the best people to preach to them as a general rule: it is to be wished that more lay House-masters would attempt the task.

That thought raises the incidental question whether Headmasters should be laymen, or in Holy Orders. I have heard it said by one Bishop that a reason for the shortage of candidates for the ministry of the Church was that so many schoolmasters were in Orders, and the boys study them, and say "at any rate I am not going to be a half-timer like him." I have also heard it said by another Bishop that a reason for the same shortage is that so many Headmasters are laymen, for as soon as the boys see a layman enter the pulpit, they say, "Well, at any rate the Sacraments don't matter." Whatever, therefore, a schoolmaster may do, he will not escape all episcopal censure. It is, perhaps, a thought worth consideration that a lay preacher may be the more effective, in that he does not say what he is professionally bound to say, and may, therefore, lead the incurably lay mind of the average human

boy to think that there is something in it. But really it does not matter whether a man is a parson or a layman: what does matter is that he should believe what he says, and so live that the school knows it.

In spite, therefore, of the fact of compulsory attendance, the School Chapel according to my conclusion, where the music and singing are good, the services well-read and reverent, where the boys take full part, and the preachers take trouble, is something which does much good, and offers a sense of worship more real than perhaps the boys will easily find again in later life. It lies at the basis of all boarding-school education, and criticism and the warfare of sects and parties should never be allowed to undermine the faith that inspires it.

The place which Holy Communion takes in the religious life of schools, though it is of vital importance, need not be discussed at the same length as that of the general Chapel Services. The difficulty associated with it is that attendance, if it is to be of any value, must always be voluntary: it must, moreover, never be used as a test of fitness for any place or office, while yet it is a test that cannot be ignored both of the religious life of an individual, and the religious life of a community. The authorities who wish to promote that religious life must act with continuous discretion, so that it may appear that attendance does not carry with it an easy road to their favour. Much stress is laid, and rightly laid, on presence

at the service of Holy Communion in the schools of to-day, and therein lies the danger for the incautious. It has happened as a result in more than one school that it has come to be generally felt that in order to become a School Prefect it was necessary to be manifestly a regular attendant at the early service. The natural consequence has followed that the better and more independent boys have deliberately stayed away, or made infrequent attendances, the more unscrupulous have gone, and earned their reward. Nor has it taken long for the results to become manifest in the general tone of the school. This is but one example of the unfortunate results of over-pressure in religious matters, and indeed the whole problem of schoolboy religion is made more difficult by the impatient, by the over-eager, who desire to see visible results, and by those who will not realize that a boy is never a man, and has not come to his full religious consciousness.

If the religious life of a school is vital, and has reality in it, it will be shown by the quite regular and sometimes crowded attendances of boys at this service. It is one of the objections of those who think that the religion of the schools is not what it ought to be that the boys who are so apparently regular at school make very rare attendances when they become undergraduates at Oxford and Cambridge, or when they leave to take up their work in life wherever it may be. It is rather hard that the schools should be blamed for this falling away, which undoubtedly

does occur in many instances: it might be answered, if any purpose were to be served by recrimination, that the school influence is strong enough to secure attendance while boys remain at that stage, but the influence of the Church is not strong enough to maintain the habit when the boy has passed to its full adult membership. But the truth rather is that religious conviction has really not gone deep enough, and the boy, while at school, attends rather because he feels that he ought to do so, than because he feels that he wants to attend, or that he derives definite spiritual benefit from attendance. At school the boy is largely under the influence of the herd instinct, and the House where it is not the thing to go to Communion, and the House where it is just as much the thing to go regularly, are features of school life perfectly familiar to most observers, and the wise observer will not attach too much importance to the one or the other.

In a healthy school the boys must be made to feel that they are perfectly free to go or not to go: here is the point where compulsion is to be utterly condemned, and all is to be voluntary. At the same time it must be made clear that to attend is the natural act of every true and loyal member of the Christian Church, and it is possible that in a good many schools there is insufficient teaching both on this point, and as to the true nature of the Sacrament. It is here that voluntary services of short prayers, and a short address, can find a fitting place, and play a very useful part.

This is not the occasion for any doctrinal treatise or theological discussion, but perhaps the feeling is not ill-founded, which certainly exists in the minds of some not unfriendly critics, that boys are not taught what the Sacrament means, and that, therefore, their attendance tends to become superstitious, because unmeaning, so that their adult judgment turns from it. There would be, if that is true, a well-grounded reason for asserting that it is largely the fault of the schools that the habit of attendance very frequently does not persist into manhood.

Fashions change even in this respect as well as others, and there is great danger that what is merely a means may be taken by some to be an end in itself. There were great Headmasters in the nineteenth century who were also great religious leaders, and exercised a strong influence in moulding the lives of their pupils, who held a Communion Service once or perhaps twice a term, and no more. There would to-day be a very general outcry that a school where such things were, was one which neglected the things of the spirit. But, after all, to be religious is not to attend Communion once a week, once a month, or once a day, but to do the will of God, to act rightly, and to "keep oneself unspotted from the world": only in so far as it means that, as it ought to mean it, is attendance at Communion valuable. It ought to mean much in a school, where all the life is corporate, and in some schools it does mean much: but in others, as is natural

with boys, the frequent becomes the commonplace and in ordinary natures you cannot prevent use from exercising a dulling influence. That is why I have never been able to feel sure that what are held to have been the benighted method of our predecessors, the method of infrequent communions which had much meaning in them, had not a good deal to be said for them.

CHAPTER IV

RELIGION (*contd.*)

THE opportunities which Confirmation brings with it are great, though they have been sometimes missed in the past; there are few parts of school life about which there gather more stories, and, I would add, more misrepresentation. One will recount the familiar tale of the group of boys found by a Headmaster of Eton clustered together outside his door, whom he forthwith took inside, and beat "*singillatim et seriatim.*" On asking them why they did not then disperse, he received the plaintive answer: "Please, sir, we're the Confirmation Class." Another will tell of the Housemaster new to his task, who confronted his small assembly of candidates in silence for many minutes while they awaited his discourse, and then with difficulty uttered the impressive words, "Boys, it is very hard to be good." Yet a third will recount that at his school joining the class was always referred to as entry for the Confirmation Stakes. As a result, parents, who are really anxious for the spiritual well-being of their sons, conclude that the preparation at public schools is often a farce, that it is at best unspiritual, and at its worst little short of blasphemous. Nothing

could be a more cruel misrepresentation of what does as a matter of fact occur, and it is with some knowledge that I say that at most schools no part of its activity, religious or secular, receives greater thought, or more anxious and careful preparation.

This is rightly so, for there is no greater opportunity for Headmaster or Housemaster, and both are concerned in it. There is no other time when they can get close to their boys' minds and souls so naturally and so easily. Of course there are still some Housemasters who content themselves with a formal hearing of the Catechism, and with lending, or giving, the boys a little book. But these are few, and most make the occasion a chance for long private interviews, and for talking over the boy's individual difficulties, and the dangers of adolescent life. This chance once well taken, the Housemaster and the boy are then on totally different terms from those on which they have been, a relation of natural friendship and confidence. If the chance does not occur, such relations of intimate trust will either not arise at all, or arise only after the boy has been in trouble, which by no means comes to the same thing. For this reason the varying practice, which has arisen through disputes and differences as to the right age for Confirmation, seems to me to have unfortunate effects.

There are those who believe that the right age is a very early one, before the thirteenth birthday: there are others who think that the right age comes later at seventeen or more. But the usual

age at a boarding-school is fifteen or sixteen. A good deal of harm has been done by the very general quotation of the remarks of a Headmaster, since promoted to high office in the Church, that he did not know what was the right age for Confirmation: he only knew that the age commonly chosen at schools was the wrong one. How often a neat turn of words sets off a fallacy! And a fallacy leading to real loss this is. For, if a boy is confirmed at twelve years of age, he understands nothing of the meaning of the rite: he is not active, and his will is not his own: he is a passive recipient of grace. Almost immediately he passes out of the region of close personal contact with those who have taught and prepared him, and he enters for a term of years into new surroundings, where he will not easily or readily give his confidence. It is no wonder that such a boy is liable to drift away from the start, and to be hard to get hold of. If, on the other hand, Confirmation is deferred to seventeen or later, the formative years are passed, and the boy has already committed himself while still without the strength which Confirmation gives and without the human guidance which he might have had. Of course there is no "right" age for Confirmation, and it depends on the individual. But for most individuals it comes most happily, and does most good, when physical changes are beginning, when the boy is entering on that stage which will bring him to manhood, and he is already forming a mind of his own.

Of course here, as everywhere in the matter of religion, we are in the presence of two theories of Divine action which are mutually exclusive. The one is that grace is conferred from without by the good will of God upon those who profess belief, and submit themselves to the system of the Church, mediated by a priesthood of Divine institution. That the recipient should understand that he should do more than submit in faith, is not demanded; for we are in the presence of a mystery, and these are the channels through which grace flows. The other belief is that Confirmation has nothing to do with childhood, but is the first definite act of manhood, the taking up by deliberate choice of the membership of the Church, and that the rite itself will mean much or little exactly as the boy brings much or little of himself to it. On the one theory it hardly matters how tender the age of the child is; on the other it makes all the difference between meaning and lack of meaning.

If we put aside this controversy, which cuts deep, it may be worth while to consider the nature of the work which is at most schools attempted at the time of Confirmation. There is first of all instruction in the Catechism, but as this is rather a formal document, there goes with it a freer and more simple discussion of great fundamental questions, such as the nature of God, the meaning of the Incarnation, and the work of the Holy Spirit. There will also be a consideration of the difficulties of school life in general, and of the individual

school in particular, for the boys are concerned most with their practical life, and its very definite problems. It is perhaps most easy to bring in this teaching through an explanation of the Commandments and the "Duty towards our neighbour" from the Catechism. There is also the individual work, generally undertaken in private by the Housemaster. In this the problem of personal purity and the meaning of sex and of sex relations will have their place, but not more than their due place. It is, I believe, a great mistake, though it is a mistake rather frequently made, to associate Confirmation in a boy's mind for ever with this one particular aspect of life to the exclusion of all others. Confirmation should rather be presented, as the Prayer Book requires it to be presented, as the taking up of full and conscious membership of a Divine community, which we do not make, but which is incomplete if we take no part. And so the great ideals of the Communion of Saints and the Kingdom of God take their natural place in the mind, and become living ideals which of themselves prepare a boy for his first Communion.

Where schools are perhaps at fault, is that, once Confirmation has taken place, the boys are dropped, and no further special interest seems to be taken in them. The school year is crowded, and Confirmation imposes a very special additional strain on masters who take it earnestly. But it is no bad thing to consider whether more could not be done than is done. It is not a difficult matter to

assemble the boys, for instance, in the following term for service or exhortation, but at present, when Confirmation is over, it is apt never to be referred to again. At any rate in setting down at some length what is attempted, and in what spirit, at most schools, I have the hope that it may comfort some dubious and distrustful fathers and mothers who have been led to believe that lay preparation is never serious or thorough, and that to let their sons be confirmed at a Public School is to cause them to forgo a great opportunity. In nine cases out of ten the exact converse is the truth.

In turning to the subject of Scripture teaching and religious instruction one enters on a very perplexed region, more perplexed than perhaps it need be. This is not the fault of the schools, save perhaps in so far as they lack courage and make only half-hearted attempts to grasp the nettle. The cause of the perplexity lies mainly in the inconsistent and mutually-exclusive interpretations of Scripture which are current among the clergy. Some are still Fundamentalists, virtually believers in Verbal Inspiration, and their disciples believe that a literal acceptance of the story of Jonah is necessary to salvation. Some accept the verdicts of criticism on the Old Testament, but will have nothing to do with them in relation to the New. Some, but a very few, are abreast of modern scholarship, and fewer still let this be known from the pulpit. The present period of transition is admittedly difficult, and

no one should be too hasty in casting stones. And for the schools it is made more difficult by the fact that boys come with far less knowledge of the Bible than was the case in the past, and the religious instruction which was once almost universal in the homes is in many homes no longer given. The result is that more has to be done in the schools, and there is less capacity to do it. For a good many schoolmasters, aware that the attitude of scholars to the Bible has changed, but not aware how it has changed, are unwilling to give instruction, profess themselves unable to give the answers which ought to be given, and get out of responsibility for giving the lesson if they can. They say that it has become the business of the expert, but this, though partially true, is true only within very modest limits. Anyone who is of the intellectual standard which can be assumed to be possessed by a master, can, with a little reading, make himself quite fit to teach a book of the Old or New Testament intelligently and well. The real reason for the objection is in most cases the confused state in which the objector finds himself, if he is a layman: he does not know what he really thinks about miracles, he does not know whether he really believes some of the Articles of the Creed, and he does not know what precise ideas he attaches to the conception of eternal life. The main reason why he does not know is that he hears such very varying views on all these matters, and, like most Englishmen, since they do not seem to him

to have direct bearing on practical conduct, he shelves them, and leaves them to the parsons. But he is mortally afraid of being asked questions about those subjects: he feels that in front of a class he might easily become a hypocrite, and give as an answer not what he believes himself but what he thinks that the boys are expected to believe.

It is sometimes said that this difficulty ought to be frankly recognized, and all Scripture teaching should be taken from the hands of self-confessed incompetents, and put in the hands of the Headmaster, or some other expert. I should be sorry to endorse this principle as anything better than a *pis-aller*. Once the Scripture teaching is in the hands of one person who visits form after form for that purpose only, the boys begin to smell a rat, and to think that the Reverend A is set to teach them what their form-masters B, C and D know too much to believe. It cuts at the root of the old form-master system, which is one of the best of the methods handed down from the old schools: the form-master, if anyone, ought to know the boys well, and he can best teach them the Bible well. I hold very strongly to the opinion, that Scripture and all English subjects can most properly be taught by the form-master, and that if he is adequately prepared to teach History and English, he can with no great trouble make himself adequately prepared to teach the Scriptures.

It is a matter also of having a considered

syllabus of not too ambitious a character. The time that can be given is usually of strictly limited extent, not more than two full periods a week, and equally limited is what can be properly attempted in the time. Some of the syllabuses of religious instruction published as being in use are so much eye-wash, and some of the best teachers of the past have not been bound by a syllabus at all. Thring, for instance, is said at times not to have got through more than one or two chapters in a term, but no part of his instruction was wasted. Unfortunately there are few Thrings. The syllabus is necessary as a guide to masters, who should be here working as a team, and there should exist in the school a library conveniently accessible to masters, where they will find the books which will show them what sort of teaching they should give. To say what that syllabus and what that teaching should be, would be to embark on a volume larger in itself than this is likely to prove, and I shall not attempt the task. But it is a task which is being faced in the schools, and only just recently a report on this question, and a valuable bibliography, have been prepared for the Headmasters' Conference. I shall content myself with saying that with the present religious background of the ordinary home it is wise for the school to concentrate on presenting the New Testament first, and the facts of the Life of Our Lord, and to use the Old Testament to drive well home the idea of progressive revelation. Nor can I help saying

that so treated, the Bible, apart from its literary treasures, becomes a far more vital and inspiring book than when it was treated from the unscientific standpoint of literal truth and verbal inspiration.

But for a long time yet it is not all going to be plain sailing. The school cannot be too careful about the textbooks which it uses, and the plain text of the Bible is often best. Some of the commentaries of the latter part of the nineteenth century are frankly dishonest, and their dishonesty is such that a boy can see through it. The argument is unfairly weighted in order to carry the reader to a supposedly orthodox conclusion, and such books have an effect which their worthy authors never intended; they produce quite a number of precocious unbelievers. Fortunately more honest and more reasonable commentaries are becoming available, but there are some parts of the much-used Cambridge Bible which might well be revised. Difficulties will for a long time to come arise from the chaotic state of the clerical mind on this subject. While writing this chapter I attended a little country church on Sunday morning, and was one of a congregation of twenty-one country folk. For some reason we were given a discourse on the Book of Revelation, and told that we must expect the devil to be chained for a thousand years, and then let loose for a season. Why this was an inspiring thought for the last Sunday of the year, was not revealed, but as the preacher naïvely

observed, it was very wonderful: but so was wireless, and wireless had happened. So let the devil look out. There was no sign that the preacher, who was the only one to teach in the district, had read anything whatever about the book. And though this incompetence is rare, yet no one can tell when he goes into any church what attitude to the Bible will be taken by the occupant of the pulpit. Similarly there are difficulties which arise with boys from crude impressions derived from previous teaching, whether it has been given at home or elsewhere. Quite lately a boy announced while out to tea that his form-master, Mr. X, was an atheist, and taught atheism. His shocked hostess drew the Headmaster's attention to the matter. He found, after tactful inquiry, that the impression had arisen from indications given by the master that there were difficulties arising from the narrative of the Gadarene swine. The boy indeed did not know what an atheist was, but he had been taught that anyone who seemed to cast doubt on the literal accuracy of Biblical narrative was an atheist. Mr. X seemed to him to cast doubt. Atheism, therefore, was what he taught. Such difficulties will, from time to time, continue to arise, but with decreasing frequency; the cause of them lies not in the schools but in the Church without.

If one word more may be added, it would be to ask those who teach the young not to teach them what they must later unlearn. It is true

advice for every stage of education, but it is advice in this subject most important, and most often neglected.

There remains to be considered what is being done, or can be done, in the schools by purely voluntary efforts. Voluntary services have certainly a part to play. They come best in the evening after a day's work, or on special occasions such as a service of preparation: their value is apt to depend entirely on the person who takes them. I have already made clear my belief that they should never be made a substitute for any part of the compulsory system. They will never appeal to all boys, nor even to a majority, unless the community as a whole is profoundly moved: but they will appeal to the few, and to them they are often a great help and refreshment. Private reading of the Bible is certainly to be encouraged, and should be practised more than it is. The actual words of the Bible are in these days less and less known, and the results of that increasing ignorance are good neither for religion nor literature. But while this practice is good, a little more trouble should be taken to see that the reading is intelligent. There are parts of the Bible that are so simple that their meaning is clear as crystal: there are others in which, for any meaning that he can get out of the passage unaided, a boy might just as well read so much gibberish. There are, however, quite good selections prepared for schoolboy reading, and some of these can be used.

There are other institutions, started from very worthy motives, which I instinctively feel are to be distrusted and discouraged. These are, on the one hand, special guilds of communicants, or special religious societies for a particular purpose of worship, or ritual, and on the other hand prayer-meetings, and groups for extempore prayer. All this sort of activity is calculated to bring a boy's religious growth into the atmosphere of the hothouse: in some cases the influence proves lasting, and the boy may become a religious bigot. In a few he is not hurt by it. In most cases the premature development is followed by reaction, and often lessons of hypocrisy have been learned on the way. The business of a boy is to grow, to gather knowledge, and to be obedient to a discipline: in religion as in all other things nothing but harm comes from trying to run before you have learned to walk, but in religion the results so obtained are often peculiarly unpleasant.

In these two chapters an attempt has been made to review what is actually attempted in those schools which have the whole life of the boy to deal with throughout a large part of the year. Questions connected with the school chapel, Holy Communion, Confirmation, Scripture teaching, and voluntary effort, have all been passed in review, doubtless inadequately, but at any rate there is hope that the reader may feel that, if school religion is in his hearing dismissed with contempt or a sneer, its failure is not due to lack of trouble taken, or lack of consideration and

care. If the results are not all that can be hoped, the cause may go deeper than the schools, and may be looked for in the religious life of the whole Church, and the attitude towards religion taken by the nation. With the repetition of the warning that much of the criticism heard comes either from those who expect from boys the full religious consciousness of men, or from those who are impatient because all boys are not taught to conform to the exact principles and beliefs of their own sect, which they honestly mistake for the Christian religion, I shall turn in another chapter to study considerations which go deeper, and are profoundly affecting the whole life of the Church.

CHAPTER V

RELIGION (*contd.*)

THE real religious difficulty in the schools arises from the failure of the Churches to maintain their hold on the nation, though I am not sure whether this has not come to be the case because the nation is more, and not less, Christian than it was. The failure of the Church of England is doubtless due to many causes, but among them must be placed prominently the fact that it now preaches two, if not three, interpretations of Christianity, which are mutually exclusive. It is true that there is still a large central body which shrinks from assuming party labels, which is not so much eclectic as still capable of holding in solution, as it were, principles of Catholicism, Protestantism, and Modernism, and the future of the Church of England depends upon whether this body shall increase or decrease. The three groups of extremists, who declare themselves against all compromise, may be logical and sincere according to their tenets, and may hope to capture the whole Church for themselves, but they will only break it into fragments. While these rivals fight one another, the educated laity, from whom schoolmasters are drawn, goes by on the other side, and

keeps out of it all. They are not dogmatic, because they have lost interest: more and more they tend to attach themselves to a very simple creed, if it is a creed; it is not new:

> "For modes of faith let graceless zealots fight:
> His can't be wrong, whose life is in the right."

Or, if they are more poetical, and in harmony with the nineteenth rather than the eighteenth century, they would say that "their faith has centre everywhere, nor cares to fix itself to form." But whether their views are nebulous and vague, or shaped as they think by plain common sense, the result is quite clear-cut, that there are in the schools an increasing number of men who do not believe in the Divinity of Christ, and who hold a second and eternal life for the individual to be an open question. These men, though they would write themselves down for the sake of old association as members of the Church of England, are not Christian. They may be, and often are, men of fine character, who act fully up to the teaching of the fifteenth Psalm, even if they fall short of the ethics of the Sermon on the Mount. But I believe that these men are living on unearned capital, a capital earned by the Christian religion, and those who have lived their lives in that faith, in the past, and that as the faith in Christ and the future life ceases to exert its influence, their moral beliefs will grow attenuated and shrivel. I believe Blake to have been profoundly right

when he said quite bluntly and simply, "Man must have a religion."

Now the reason why I am spending so much time, in a short book, on the subject of religion is that it lies at the base of all education. It cannot be taught in the abstract. It is not a subject of the school curriculum, like the other subjects, to be put in, or left out, at convenient seasons. It underlies the whole life, and is the inspiration of the whole life's effort. Therefore we ought to make up our minds what is the definite Christianity which we wish to be at the basis of our national Christianity, and we have frankly to face the plain facts of the present position that there are two alternative religions before the nation, and between these choice has to be made.

On the one hand, we have as the central object of our faith Jesus born of a Virgin, a Son and a Mother, or it may be, primarily a Mother and a Son. The figure of God the Father is nebulous, the Holy Spirit is not as a wind that bloweth where it listeth, but it is operative through the Church, through the lives of many Saints, through a Divine Society whose life is entirely mediated by a priesthood possessing all the prerogative and authority of Apostolic Succession, and through the Sacrament which is through the same power and privilege of the priesthood a daily enacted miracle. Salvation is possible for every sinner who surrenders his private judgment, and receives direction in humility and faith. The Bible has not much place in this system, for little authority

for it can be found in the Bible. It ignores modern science because it claims to be operative in another plane, and is in theory mystical. It does not talk much of progress, and puts little reality into the prayer "Thy kingdom come on earth," for it believes that human nature is in itself irretrievably fallen, and only to be saved by membership of the Society. It is cold towards ideals of service to the State, and all purely human institutions, for the true life is lived elsewhere. It does not look back to Galilee and Jerusalem, but to Imperial Rome and the Mystery Religions. It produces in a number of cases lives of great holiness and devotion: it maintains a discipline which receives a wonderful loyalty. But the whole is directed by politicians and statesmen who consider first and last always the interests of the Church. *Salus ecclesiae suprema lex.*

Such is the system of Roman Catholicism, and it was rejected by the English nation at and after the Reformation. It does not hold the manhood of Italy, France or Germany, though it sways a strong party in each. Its strength lies in its appeal to mysticism, to emotion, to weariness, and to ignorance. It says, "Come unto Me, all ye that are weary, and I will give you rest"—at a price, which England as a whole is unwilling to pay. But there are within the Church of England many who seek not so much to graft this system on to its teaching as to transform the whole Church into its image, and all that for

the present they omit is submission to the Papacy. The position of Rome is clear and honest: there can be no choice, and they offer no choice, between submission and outlawry. The position of the extreme Anglo-Catholic party in the Church of England is much more dubious, and while among their priests are to be found men of the utmost devotion and of saintly lives, yet they are disloyal to their superiors and to the tenets of a Church in which they only remain because they seek to change it.

On the other hand, there is another interpretation of Christianity which frankly accepts the Bible, and bases itself on what it finds there, and as frankly accepts all knowledge that proves itself worthy of incorporation into the system of science. It regards Creation as a never-ending process, in which God has been and is active, from the confusion of mere chemical elements to the coming of life, from life in its earliest microscopic forms to the coming of species, from the emergence of species to the appearance of man recognizable as man. With the Bible it sees in man the growing point of the whole process: with the Bible and through the pages of the Old Testament it traces the progressive revelation of God: it recognizes that in other countries and in other civilizations there was a similar progressive revelation, but in the spiritual sense salvation came from the Jews: with the New Testament it believes that in Jesus God became Man, the Word became flesh, and dwelt among us. It

believes that this was so because man had become self-conscious, aware of a destiny, and that, therefore, man must of necessity be given an ideal by which to grow, and hence the manifestation of Him Who was the Way, the Truth, and the Life. It believes that the Holy Spirit was given, and continues from generation to generation to illumine all those who live the life, and seek the spiritual values; it believes that God was in Jesus, is in Christ, is in the Holy Spirit, a Trinity in Unity. It holds that he who lives for the good, the true, and the beautiful, begins to live eternally, and will find a place eternally in the Father's House that has many mansions. It relies on the words of Jesus Christ, and it finds its highest inspiration in the Fourth Gospel. It believes that individuality endures, that this life is a testing-ground, that "character is destiny," and that God, because He is Love, is also a God of Law and Justice. It counts it a duty to strive that the Kingdom may come on earth, as it is in heaven.

It is clear that these are two systems, a faith once for all delivered, and a faith progressive and widening, as the thoughts of men widen. They cannot exist together inside the same Church without disrupting it, as they are disrupting the Church of England to-day, and they cannot be taught inside the same school, or the same national system of education. One, or other, must go outside into schools of its own. I believe that England has long ago made its choice, and that

the right system for English schools is that which I have described the second in order. Its emphasis is entirely on character, and the emphasis so laid was laid first by Jesus Christ: by their fruits are men known. It has comparatively few adherents in the world because in the past the Protestant Churches have forgotten the Holy Spirit, have been afraid of knowledge, and have stopped at the Cross. They have not fully realized the meaning of the Resurrection and Pentecost. But this belief looks to the future, and it will grow: the laity will return to the churches when they find there the words of affirmation and adventure. Simple as it is, it requires education from those who preach it, and from those who believe, but it is not an esoteric faith. They who do the will shall know the doctrine, and the first call is to do the will.

The danger and unrest of the present age arise from the fact that in Europe and America, and for that matter over large areas of the supposedly changeless East, the human race has cut itself, or is cutting itself, loose from all moorings of thought and custom. General Smuts said in a striking phrase no more than the truth when he declared that humanity has struck its tents, and is everywhere on the march. The question is, whither? and no man can be bold enough to answer the question with confidence. Every social convention and institution, even the most fundamental, and every religious sanction and conviction, must be put to the test, and stand inquiry. The plain

fact is that humanity has been kept moral by fear and by the acceptance of certain "social" taboos, which have their foundation, indeed, in true morality, and in the fundamental needs of the human race. But when vast masses are set free from the fear of Hell, and have come to consider all things as matters of opinion, they will not be restrained by any attempt to re-establish a state of torment for the damned, or to re-create the dominance of "taboos" by authority. What is necessary, is on the basis of religion to show that the purpose and end of our existence is to be fellow-members in living well, in creating a common life as noble as we can make it, that it is a high adventure, and that we should live in that spirit. There are rules for right living which are quite definitely ascertainable, not only based on the experience of the race and the authority of our ancestors, but themselves in conformity with reason and justice. We are free to will, and the summons of religion to us is to will what is God's will, or to will what is right, which is but another way of putting it. We, moreover, live in a Universe which is a system of law and order, and the rules which govern it are equally ascertainable: both in the physical and the moral sphere causes lead to effects, and acts lead to eternal consequences. The one thing impossible even for God is to make undone that which has been done.

Therefore the great hope of the world lies in an education which is based on religion, on doing

the Will of God, and whose end is before everything else the production of character: it must put right action before knowledge and right opinion. Now the sad thing about schoolmasters is that so many do not realize this, and think that their business begins and ends with putting a certain amount of knowledge into immature brains: and the hard thing for schoolmasters comes when they find what their true business is, and realize that character is not a thing which can be taught. It is for them not a matter of right teaching, but of right living. For the boy the way to the higher life is in nearly all cases opened by personal inspiration. It may not come direct, it may seem almost accidental, but it is some deed, some chance word it may be, as well as the force of an example intimately known, that lights the fire in another heart. The boy will follow, and almost blindly believe, the man who lives his faith, and has singleness of heart. But he is very quick to detect the man who does not really believe what he professes to believe and the man whose life is a compromise: he is never for long imposed on by the man who professes one kind of standard in school, and obviously seeks and enjoys quite other standards out of school. Shams, whether ecclesiastical or lay, are of no service in the schools any more than the timid men who will not face up to a difficulty.

While the Churches are still striving to disentangle themselves from traditions which are no longer living, still discussing reunion in word,

while refusing it in meaning and in practice, still in effect, like the scribes of old, making the Word of God of none effect through their tradition, it is a call to the teaching profession as a whole, to every part of it, to seek to bring up a generation that will have learned to fear God and to live rightly and for spiritual values. I know that this will be called unpractical idealism, and that when you get down to hard facts I shall be told that the business of the schoolmaster is to teach the Rule of Three, and that bringing in the Kingdom of God doesn't help the process. But my answer is that even though his business in the class-room is to teach the Rule of Three, it makes a lot of difference what sort of a man he is, whether he knows his boys, and for what values he stands: and if he is a good enough man to stand for the values that are right, and the boys know it and feel it, he will impart not only the Rule of Three more efficiently but he will impart other things that are of far more value. Nor am I asking all schoolmasters to be talkers and preachers: there are perhaps enough of them already in a distracted world. I ask them to be doers, to set their course by a spiritual standard, so that the children will come after them in the only living way. If once in all the schools we can set out in one spirit on this great quest and adventure, we can heal the weakness of the Churches from without, we can ennoble the whole character of our nation, and through our nation and our nation's example we can

benefit a sick world. Nor does my vision confine itself to this country: as great, or even greater, a work waits to be done by the teaching profession in the Dominions, and the United States of America. It is a call as wide as the world to the teachers of the English-speaking races.

To come back from this vision to the consideration of the subject from which I set out, the character of the religion of the boarding-school, may seem like making a descent from the skies to the earth. It is easy to coin epigrams, and to sneer at the total result, to say, for instance, that public-school religion must be worthless, since it counts for nothing with the average boy in comparison with the convention of his House: the only question for him in any matter of doubt is whether a thing is "done," or "not done." But observers of boys are apt to be superficial, and very hasty in their judgments. Most boys at public schools and elsewhere have their ideals, but they do not talk about them any more than they talk about those "make-believes" which are the first forms under which they clothe their ideals in childhood. They will talk of them to individual friends in shy ways, and now and again to an elder who has won their confidence, but never talk of them in a crowd, and never in the presence of people who are clever and cocksure. Further, a crowd of boys is always at a lower moral level than the individual boys who make up the crowd, a fact which often escapes the notice of external critics. Most boys, again,

pray, and have a real sense of God in their lives, often childish and rudimentary, but none the less real and true. "I thank Thee, Lord, Father of heaven and earth, that Thou hast hid these things from the wise and prudent, and hast revealed them unto babes. Even so, Father, for so it was well-pleasing in Thy sight." Most boys carry away from a good school certain conceptions more or less consciously realized. The first is a definite desire for right conduct, a desire, as the boy would say, to live decently, and to do something that may be of real use in the world. Another is a sense of membership of a community which stands for something higher than that to which he could individually attain, which therefore lifts him on to a higher level of achievement. It may start from nothing higher than a desire not to let his school down, but it has tuned his mind to all possibilities of high co-operation. A third is some sense of the meaning of the Kingdom of God, a world to be made better, social conditions to be altered, something real conveyed in the vague word progress. All this may or may not be definitely related to religion in his mind. But in the great mass of boys it is something: it is questionable whether in the present state of the world and the present state of the homes and of English social life, one could fairly expect more. The boarding-schools have no reason to be ashamed of the fact that the Chapel stands in their centre, for it stands for something which in their lives is neither altogether hypocritical, nor altogether unreal.

CHAPTER VI

DISCIPLINE

THE English tradition has discipline at its centre and definitely relies upon it. It is, however, unfashionable in advanced circles of present-day thought to talk of discipline, for we are told that we should use more rational methods to secure higher ends. It is supposed that personality is sacred, and that discipline in some way violates these sanctities: it is also assumed that the discipline of schools, and in particular public schools, is always unintelligent, and not infrequently brutal. As it is always illuminating, if one desires to know what a thing is, to know how it has come to be, it may prove helpful to consider how the present conception of discipline has arisen in the schools in order that we may know what it is, and how it works.

A century ago, and even less than a century ago, conditions in the great schools were frankly barbaric and brutal, often to an extreme. There were, indeed, other schools in which conditions were much more reasonable, but they were private institutions. In most, if there was any maxim held in universal honour, it was that sparing the rod would certainly spoil the child, and the fact

that the children were being spoiled wholesale does not seem to have disturbed the equanimity of those curious clerics who carried out so wholeheartedly the teaching of Holy Writ. They flogged their way through term after term with a high sense of duty accomplished, flogged if a lesson were not known, flogged for inattention, flogged for disorder, flogged for bullying, flogged for vice. Often they did not know who the boys were whom they flogged, or why they flogged them. Anthony Trollope relates with some bitterness how Dr. Butler stopped him in the street at Harrow, and said, "Can it be that I have such an incredibly dirty boy in my school?" He ought to have known, writes Trollope, for he had flogged me often enough, and only that morning. So did they exercise what one of the old school, in remonstrating with me for my regrettably infrequent use of the rod, described to me as the sacred right of chastisement committed to the Headmaster. The results were remarkable. Winchester, though it enjoyed the institution of prefects, passed through mutiny after mutiny in the eighteenth century, and as late as 1818 put up so spirited a resistance to authority that it had to be quelled by a company of regular soldiers. Keate assembled the whole of Eton to watch the flogging of his Sixth Form, but he did not think of resigning after that performance. It is a dismal story.

To take a school which had a clear start, free from all traditions, good or bad, let us for a

moment consider Marlborough, filled with boys in 1843, largely from country rectories. By 1850 they had become a school which took a new boy, a child of eight years of age, tied him to a bench in Upper School, where there were throngs of boys present, and branded him with an anchor on the forearm by means of a red-hot poker. Seventy-one years later I saw the scar, a mark extending from the forearm to the wrist. There was, so far as the victim was aware, no punishment, though he had to spend three weeks in the Sick House. The mentality of these boys was such that they collected in gangs to beat frogs to death with sticks in the Wilderness, and to fill buckets with their bodies. They poached, and they thieved through the countryside. In the midst of this world the Rev. Matthew Wilkinson, Headmaster, preached edifying sermons on Christian doctrine, couched in rounded periods of piety and propriety. In 1851 the school broke into open mutiny, the last of the mutinies of the public schools. In the years during which I was at the head of the same school, less than seventy years later, I had to deal with only one case of serious mishandling of a boy by his fellows, and that was the punishment of a boy who had been guilty of cruelty to a cat. What has been the cause of the change? For it is not due to decline of high spirit: I believe the boys of to-day to be stronger, fitter, and pluckier than their ancestors.

The main cause has been a complete change in the spirit of the relations of masters and boys,

and a return to the obscured and forgotten tradition that education is concerned with the right use of leisure. In those old days of the early nineteenth century there was but one sanction, fear. Assistant masters did not know boys out of school, and were doubtless glad to be out of their way. The boys, neglected, underfed, and dirty, were left to their own devices for playtime and preparation. At Harrow the whole school was collected in Fourth Form Room for two hours' preparation, without a master, and the key turned on them. What went on behind that door? At Eton in the old Long Chamber seventy boys were locked up by themselves from 8 p.m. to the following morning. Thring, who was one of them, wrote in 1862: "A mob of boys cannot be educated. Not five and twenty years ago, with open gates up to eight o'clock at night all the year round, and sentinels set the winter through, as regularly as in the trenches before Sebastopol, to warn us of the coming master, the boys of the finest foundation in the world starved their way up to the university. Whistle or hiss marked the approach of friend or foe. Rough and ready was the life they led. Cruel, at times, the suffering and the wrong: wild the profligacy. For after eight o'clock at night no prying eye came near till the following morning: no one lived in the same building: cries of joy or pain were equally unheard: and, excepting a code of laws of their own, there was no help or redress for any one." What tortures

and cruelties have been enacted round the great fire at Winchester!

It required wisdom, courage, and persistence to break down this vicious system, and it could only be done in the old schools by great personalities. It was easier work in the newer foundations. If I pick out three individual names whom I most associate with the changes which have transformed the schools, it is not because I do not realize that what went on was a process in which many took part. Ideas spread from school to school; there is such a thing as a "movement" being "in the air." But the first dawn of the better order was when Arnold made the prefect system a reality at Rugby, and of this I have already spoken. We should not be right if we thought of the schools of those days as if they were a school of the present. Arnold ruled through his Sixth Form as an autocrat might rule a disorderly city through his chosen corps of guards: those who were not in the Sixth were potential mutineers. But he had done the great thing: he had associated the best elements of the school with himself. He had not, like the miserable Keate, exhibited the disgrace of his leading boys to the whole school, but he had offered them the adventure of becoming rulers and examples. And youth responded, as it always will. He had defined and established the fundamental principle of the true English discipline that you must obey loyally in order that you may be fit to rule wisely.

But the main body of the school still remained uncivilized. They were still dirty: they had to be, for they could not wash: still hungry: they had to be, for they did not get enough food. The "natural enemy" theory of the relations of boys and masters still persisted, for it was thoroughly justified. Then there began the civilizing process with which I associate the name of Thring, not because he was the only one who realized that, if you wish to civilize a human being, you must put him in civilized surroundings, and occupy his leisure with something better than compulsory idleness, but because he realized it most consciously, and having a free hand in the creation of a new school, was able to work out his ideas with fewer obstacles. I shall honour his memory by quoting his own words:

"Never rest until you have got the almighty wall on your side, and not against you. Never rest till you have got all the fixed machinery for work, the best possible. The waste in a teacher's workshop is the lives of men"; and again:

"There is a large percentage of temptation, criminality, and idleness in the great schools—a moral miasma—generated by known causes, and as certainly to be got rid of even by mere mechanical improvements—a little moral drainage—as the average sickness of a squalid district. . . ."

"Bullying is fostered by harshness in the masters, and by forcing boys to herd together in promiscuous masses."

"Lying is fostered by general class rules which take no cognizance of the ability of the individual to keep them; and they cannot do so when each boy is not sufficiently well known for his master to understand, sympathize with, and feel for him."

"Idleness is fostered, when there are so many boys to each master, that it becomes a chance when it will be detected, and a certainty that no special intelligent teaching and help will be given, or indeed can be given, to the individual when in difficulty."

"Rebellion and insubordination are fostered, when from the same causes many boys who are either backward or want ability, find no care bestowed on them, are obnoxious to arbitrary punishments, have nothing to interest them or give them self-respect, and learn in consequence to look upon their masters as natural enemies."

"Sensuality is fostered, when these and like boys, from the same causes, are launched into an ungoverned society without any healthy interest, anything higher than the body to care for (the mental part being unmixed bitterness), thrown on their own resources or want of resources, often exposed to scorn in school, whilst the numbers and confusion give every hope of escaping detection."

"The atmosphere of schools is, in consequence, in all their out-of-the-way regions thick with falsehood and wrong: no more necessary, however, than a fog on an undrained field, when the

country round is clear, but considered necessary by the old-fashioned farmer because it has always been so."

With this work of moral drainage the name of Thring will always be associated as the great pioneer: it was the great work of all the schools in the nineteenth century. Only in one respect do I demur to his teaching, and then not to the spirit of it, but to the overstatement, that the almighty wall is the final arbiter of schools. The final arbiter is the influence of personality upon personality, and I can imagine the finest of teaching being given in a ditch-bottom, or a disused cowshed. To-day we are in danger of falling into the opposite extreme, and thinking when we have built sunny class-rooms, fine laboratories, noble assembly hall, and hung them with autotypes, that we have created a good school. It may be, but it will depend upon the men and the boys: for it is in the end true that "men, not walls, make a city." But amid the tolerated meannesses and ugliness of the schools when Thring was young it was before all things expedient that what he said and did so forcibly should be said and done.

The growth of natural and easy relations between masters and boys was of still later date, though doubtless it too was a process going on in all the schools. I would associate it with the name of Edward Bowen, whose work at Harrow was done in the last decades of the nineteenth century, and who is much more than the author

of the most immortal of school songs. He was in many of his views and in his practice a teacher much in advance of his time. He was the enemy of that strange delusion which still exists in a few quarters, that it does not matter what a boy learns so long as you make him learn it, and that it is of no importance whatever that work should interest the learner. On the contrary, he set out to make work interesting. He believed that a teacher should be himself an interesting man, because he is a man of wide interests which should extend beyond the range of school life. He saw no reason why a joke should not be cracked in a class-room. He hated stiffness and starch and formality. He was one of the first creators of a modern side, as in those days it was understood: he dreamed that Greek need not be compulsory, and that there might be a use for translations even in the hands of boys. But he was also an ideal Housemaster, the friend and companion of his boys, who kept the eternal boy alive within his own breast to the very end. He is the great example of the modern spirit at its best, a man who had in lavish measure from nature the gifts which the Housemaster would wish to possess, but who was also conscious of the reasons for his actions.

The change which I am trying to trace was also brought about by more impersonal influences, notably by the growth of games. Of these I hope to speak more fully later, but here I speak of them merely as the most dominant of those

occupations which filled up the spare time of boys, and exhausted their superfluous energies. It is an unworthy way in which to speak of athletics, but from my present point of view it is obvious that they kept the idle hobbledehoy out of mischief, and gave him a motive for avoiding smoking, drinking, and things yet worse. Games came to be reinforced by school societies and opportunities for the following of hobbies, from natural history to music, from art to debating societies. Many deplore the over-athleticism of the schools, who have little idea, since individual memories cannot be long, of the state of the schools before games were regularly played. They were, from one aspect, part of the discipline by which Satan is prevented from providing mischief.

Finally, among the other impersonal influences the growth of the Preparatory Schools must not be forgotten. These take boys at a tender age, and pass them on to the big schools usually before they are fourteen: they thus save the big schools from harbouring an extreme range of ages, and render both groups of schools more homogeneous. They break boys in, and by kindly methods teach them something of the standards to which they are expected to conform, something of the discipline of the life which they will have to live, together with the first steps of the knowledge which they will be expected to gain. Some of these Preparatory Schools are public schools in miniature, with their

captains and prefects, their teams and competitions, their ordered life, and their Chapel services. Perhaps they even do the work too thoroughly, and impose responsibilities which are too great, and conceptions which are too advanced, for little boys. But I think that it is more due to them than to any other influence that the problem of the untrained horde, which was the problem of Headmasters in the middle of the nineteenth century, no longer exists for the schools of to-day.

The result of all this development is that an easy but definite discipline runs through the life of the community. It is the business of everybody to obey orders: it is expected that the orders will be reasonable, but they are there not to be criticized but obeyed. A number of boys are given definite responsibilities, small or great: they are carefully watched in order that it may be known how they carry them out. If they fail, they know that they have no grievance if they are relieved of their offices. Rules do not on the whole play a great part: it is a mistake to suppose that boys' lives are hedged about by regulations. They have their own customs and traditions which are often subtle, intricate, and even obscure, but these vary very much from school to school. Of course there have been some schools which, like Gresham's School, Holt, under Howson, had no written rules at all, and no "lock-up." Almond of Loretto saw, if not "red," at least red-tape,

when he saw rules, and he, too, reduced them to a minimum. But in most schools they are not felt, and the best school rule that I have seen was that which used to be printed at the head of the Marlborough rules, that "a breach of common sense is a breach of a school-rule." Under this system boys must be punctual, and they must be orderly, do what they are told, and go whither they are told, under penalty, if they fail: in the maintenance of the system they are given responsibilities, which may vary from the captaincy of a small dormitory to a position which demands real qualities of organization and command, such as the Headship of a large school, or the captaincy of a school game. The system works well by the only test worth having, that of practice: it makes for efficiency, and the happiness of the greatest number. It is a great mistake to suppose that boys resent it.

The excessive use of corporal punishment in the past has brought a natural reaction in its train, and there are those who think that as a method of punishment it should be allowed to become obsolete altogether. There are those who still believe that a public school is a scene of incessant floggings, and others have visions of tender and sensitive new boys having their spirit broken by the continual secret castigations which they receive from senior schoolfellows who are in authority over them. But these pictures are very exaggerated, and the use of corporal punishment is steadily growing less and less. It

is proper that a House Captain should have the right to cane, so long as the caning is not inflicted at the time of the offence, and so long as a record of it is kept, and an appeal allowed to higher authority, if desired. Caning is not felt by English boys to be a degradation, and is not so looked upon. It is a quick and effective way of dealing with "uppishness" and insubordination. Nevertheless, if a Housemaster discovered that his captain was making, or wishing to make, free use of the stick, he would know that his House had gone all wrong, and would presumably take measures accordingly. Caning by the Headmaster stands in an altogether different category, and *should* be regarded as degrading: there are not many offences for which it is the proper penalty. My own opinion is that it may be rightly employed in the case of boys who are inveterate idlers or rule-breakers, of those who have cheated, and of those who are bullies. Even so, it is not always the right treatment for the cheat, and psycho-analysts tell us that it is never right for bullies, since these are the perverted natures which love pain. I have, however, never observed evidence of this in the case of the few bullies with whom I have sought to deal faithfully. The mere sending-up to the Headmaster should be a severe penalty in itself, and in most cases the Headmaster will find more lasting methods of dealing with the offender than the time-honoured castigation which, in spite of all the humbug that is talked about

it, is for both sides so easy a way out of the difficulty.

Another method of making easier the maintenance of discipline, which is in force, and used in many schools, is by superannuation. I confess that under present conditions I fail to see the justice of the method. Schools admit boys after an examination by which they profess to satisfy themselves that the boy is fit to do the work of the school. They ought to be equal to the task of educating him for the next three years. But if a boy is getting near the age of seventeen, and has got nowhere in the school, and is never likely to do so, then for his own sake the parents should be advised to take him away. For this simple process it is hardly worth while to maintain elaborate rules of superannuation, which imply that the school expects to fail in a large number of cases. Nor can it be argued with justice that the superannuation of a boy does not as a matter of fact set upon him a mark of inferiority and implant a feeling which often lasts for life.

The Public Schools, again, are often attacked for making too free use of expulsion. It is a severe penalty, and no one resorts to it unless he feels that there is no choice. In the case of the boy who thieves from his fellows, it is necessary because the boy has made his life impossible in the community, but he should always be provided with an opportunity of a fresh beginning elsewhere. In the case of the boy of open in-

discipline or of active immorality, expulsion is not only necessary but just. Medical men who usually advise parents about these cases, and study them from the purely individual point of view, frequently argue that expulsion is the wrong treatment: they forget the responsibility of the school to the parents of the other boys. They themselves would never leave a patient with smallpox in a dormitory of healthy people, and it has always been somewhat astonishing to me that they should think that a schoolmaster should think twice about permitting a detected corrupter to range free inside a school.

The rule of discipline, then, is that you must do your duty, or pay the penalty: authority comes from above, but all share in delegated powers for the purpose of living a common life. This is supposed to be contrary to the modern democratic spirit, in which authority, such as it may be, is delegated from below. *Vox populi, vox Dei.* Attempts have been made to graft these modern conceptions on to the old stock and tradition of the schools, such as self-government by forms, and various types of school democracies, in which rules are proposed and seconded, and voted upon, and all officials are appointed by popular election. I can only say that these seem to me to be mere idle wasting of time. The business of a school is to work, and to get on with its life without bothering about Whys, and Wherefores, and abstract justice, and the democratic principle. I have always felt

sympathy with the boy who in quite recent times, having been promoted from a form in which self-government was practised not without flourishing of trumpets, was found by the master of the form above to be ignorant of his irregular verbs. "I should have thought, Jones," said the master, "that you would have learned your verbs with Mr. X." "Yes, sir," answered the aggrieved Jones, "but how could I? We spent all our time debating what was the right penalty for Smith, when he sucked bull's-eyes in form." Boys again as a whole make bad electors. They are too immature, and too easily swayed. I say this as a word of warning to those who would bequeath scholarships, and prizes of value, to be awarded on the voting of schoolboys.

The tradition is that the schools are not autonomous, or self-legislating, but that they accept a discipline in order to live a common life: every one sees the sense of the rules, and the happiness of every one is found in carrying them out, or conforming to them loyally. When this is understood, when there is that indefinable thing, a good "tone," then much freedom can be rightly allowed. It is a tradition from a more difficult past, still too much followed in some schools, to allow too little freedom, and too little unoccupied time. Howson and Almond went very far in the opposite direction, but they moved on right lines. Still more is it contrary to the English tradition to have constant espionage and surveillance: to assume that the boys will certainly

be acting wrongly in secret, and that it is the master's business to catch them out, is the very best way to produce the evils against which you are anxious to guard. The system of giving plenty to do, but allowing reasonable leisure, is natural, and works easily. It is not a system which necessitates punishments, nor do boys, who feel that they are trusted, abuse freedom. One may be kind and indulgent to first offences, for they are usually not repeated. But the only sound rule for a Headmaster is that, if he does bite, he should bite hard. He should let it be known that under the soft glove there is a steel gauntlet. For boys need to be protected from themselves. They are strange creatures, who will play the fool, and yet strongly resent the fact that they are allowed to do it, who will little by little go to all lengths to break rules, and bemoan their fate that they are at a school where such things can be both possible and undiscovered. I think I remember reading in a book somewhere by A. C. Benson a very typical story of an English schoolboy, who was sent up to the Headmaster for the remarkable offence of having, at the moment when his form-master was stooping forward to correct his exercise, slipped between his collar and his neck a dormouse. "How was I to know," he said, with starting tears of aggrieved indignation, "that he would draw the line at dormice?"

It is an objection very frequently taken against the English schools that they create a "type."

It is to be admitted frankly that they do, that a very strong force of public opinion takes hold of a boy at a susceptible age, and moulds him to its forms. But what these critics seem continually to forget is the plain fact that every collection of human beings tends to create a type, even if they are all apostles of individualism and freedom. The students of the Latin Quarter in former days owed allegiance to few laws and conventions, but they created a type. So did the habitués of Chelsea. Gilbert would have missed some very favourable subjects for his satire if this were not the case. And therefore the question to be asked is not whether every human community, educational or other, creates a type, but does it create a good type? Does it, or does it not, bring out the best qualities of an Englishman?

It is a discipline which is not Prussian in spirit, or military, or hide-bound. It is not unintelligent, but coexists with an atmosphere of free criticism in which everybody will have the opportunity of learning more frankly than in any other community exactly what is thought of him. The small boy goes to his Preparatory School, and after certain years he rises to high office, becomes a dormitory captain, perhaps captain of the XI: he is a Triton among the minnows. He goes on to his Public School: he is a new boy, a minnow among the Tritons. Again he climbs by the same methods, he reaches the VIth, he is a prefect, he represents the school. Twice over he has learned the qualities which

others trust, and tasted the reward for work done. He leaves, and becomes nobody, a new boy in the outer world. Is it a bad preparation for the third stage, the ordeal of practical life? I at any rate think not, since the same qualities which have stood him in good stead will help him now, and his very failures in his school career will point him the way to better methods of applying his energies.

What would be the effect if this method of character-training were universal and real in the schools of the country of every type, if all knew a real discipline combined with a real freedom? At its best it is a system of training in which the boy is taught to choose what he ought to choose, and that is the real freedom; not the pseudo-freedom of many-headed uneducated democracy in which there is at most the negative freedom by which each one chooses what he individually desires, and the common life is denied. It would, I think, make more possible than is the case to-day, national effort towards a common ideal, a sum of individual wills which would make towards a more worthy life. Only on this basis of a common national discipline will our individual difficulties be solved, and our country put forth a united effort, with its full weight behind it, not only in the market-places but the council chambers of the world. All this may be a dream, but it is worth dreaming.

CHAPTER VII

CULTURE

IT is to be regretted that German associations have made this word unpopular, for there is no other which will serve the purpose of expressing the intellectual ideal at which the higher education of schools should aim. An ideal is something of which human effort is likely to fall short, and even if the ideal of culture that is here to be suggested may seem to the reader something never attained yet, nor even in practice attainable, I would suggest that it may be none the less valuable for all that. "That low man goes on adding one to one. His hundred's soon hit. This high man, aiming at a million, misses a unit." A quotation from the *Grammarian's Funeral* may be pardoned, because it is apposite: there are some who might think that title itself to be no bad description of the course of this long controversy over the curriculum, which engaged the attention of the nineteenth century, and still rages. At any rate, this chapter will partly concern itself with what has been, and partly with what might be: that which is, if the reader has patience, will engage our attention later.

Latin was the universal language of the Middle

Ages, and the Renaissance added Greek. These two languages unlocked the available store of human knowledge, and the study of them became the unquestioned business of the schools. More than two centuries elapsed before there was any stirring of new life, and by that time the curriculum had become not only dead but desiccated. It was much the same at the beginning of the nineteenth century at all the great schools. The young boys learned the Latin Grammar in Latin, and memorized all the rules before being called upon to apply any. At the top of the school there were perhaps ten construing lessons in the week, and nearly as many repetition lessons: at least three compositions would be sent up, a Latin essay, Latin verses, and Latin lyrics or Greek iambics. The books read were strangely selected: Lucian was translated, but Thucydides and Demosthenes were not touched: Cornelius Nepos and Pomponius Mela were preferred to Tacitus. It is probable that none of the authors were studied as if related to any human background whatever: they were the traditional texts in which one searched for grammatical examples, and phrases for composition. What most boys gained from it was a knowledge of Virgil and Horace well beaten into them, both literally and metaphorically, and on it was based that love of rather splendid rhetoric which characterized the eighteenth century. You could quote either poet in the House of Commons, and be sure of answering appreciation.

The Edinburgh Reviewers in 1830 attacked the system wholeheartedly, and started the conflict of which the end is not yet. The schools answered slowly and reluctantly, for most of the Headmasters who have during the nineteenth century been accepted leaders of the profession have been men to whom the last ditch is familiar ground: they themselves have been the successful product of a system which they see no reason to change. The answer of Arnold to the first attack was to introduce French, mathematics, and history, and to teach the classics from a new point of view. Dean Stanley wrote, and the claim which he makes has not been denied, that "he (Arnold) was the first Englishman who drew attention in our public schools to the historical, political, and philosophical value . . . of the ancient writers, as distinguished from the mere verbal criticism and elegant scholarship of the last century." But in the schools he found few imitators. Those who set the new model were those great teachers, Butler and Kennedy, successively Headmasters of Shrewsbury, who revised, or caused to be revised, the grammars, who taught thoroughly from the best models, and who brought real literary appreciation and a glowing enthusiasm to their task. As a result, the "grand old fortifying classical curriculum" developed on lines too purely grammatical and metrical: not content of thought, but perfection of form was sought, the collection of phrases and not of ideas.

This great tradition—for it was a great tradition—of classical education prevailed not only at the great boarding-schools, but it was dominant in the great day-schools. These were directly inspired from Rugby, but it was more of the spirit of Butler than of Arnold that was carried to King Edward's, Birmingham, to Manchester and St. Paul's, to Bedford and Merchant Taylors'. It was a great tradition because within its limits it valued knowledge, and exactness, sought at infinite pains the right word, and was sensitive to all beauty of form. When followed by a course of history and philosophy, and the study of political thought, it was, and is, perhaps the finest educational instrument which has yet been devised for the minds so endowed by nature as to be able to profit by it. But it is by no means an instrument suitable for all.

Some very imperfect imitation of this system prevailed in the grammar schools, so far as they called themselves classical, and many of them were prevented by the terms of their foundation from being anything else. But others attempted to provide a modern or commercial education to suit the needs of the day. They had no thought-out system and no experience to guide them, no equipment or tradition for the teaching of modern languages, or science, and they suffered from a very early leaving age. As might be expected, no constructive or formative ideas proceeded from these schools.

The formative ideas were slowly gathering shape

in many quarters, in the Mechanics' Institutes, in such places as University College, London, and the new London University, in the democratic education of Scotland, and in the whole spirit of the new demand for national education. It had been the theory of England that higher education was the privilege of the aristocracy and the rich, and that they could afford the luxury of an education totally unrelated to the facts of modern life. But the facts of modern life were there, clamouring to be understood, and new classes of society were seeking to be taught. Above all, there was science, on the applications of which the wonderful industrial system was based, science which was the foundation of the unlimited advance which was opening before humanity. Scientific education was demanded on both grounds, to make the working-people better workers, to make production more efficient, and also because it was a worthy subject of higher training, a necessary part of modern education, a field in which the intellect, unswayed by passion, prejudice, or emotion, sought knowledge for its own sake. So started the unnecessary battle between Science and the Humanities. Huxley was the prophet of the nobler appeal. Science excited and purified the sense of wonder and admiration. It raised the ultimate problems of existence in the mind. It proceeded rigorously from cause to effect, taught the theory of causation in the best way, was an exact intellectual discipline, and was not without its effects in the

sphere of morals and character. Moreover, there was a scientific method which was universal, and should be familiar to the minds of all educated men. Huxley was right, and the claim that he made has been recognized in the modern conception of education. But unfortunately it was not on the strength of Huxley's argument, or on the noble lines of his thought, that science made its way into the schools. It came into most schools as a purely utilitarian subject, and was taught ignobly in a utilitarian spirit. In the latter part of the nineteenth century science began to be taught indeed in the great schools of the old tradition, but it entered as a poor relation, and was often very badly taught: unfounded generalizations were then made that educationally the subject was of little value. On the other hand, in schools which were responsive to the democratic and utilitarian appeal, which claimed that only subjects should be taught which were of use, little but mathematics and science were taught, and these with such unfortunate effect that the boys went out into the world, illiterate and uneducated. And so for long things went on, the Humanities refusing a proper place to Science, and Science refusing a proper place to the Humanities.

There still exists this severance as a result of those distracted days. One finds in the writing of such an author as, for instance, Mr. H. G. Wells, the profound conviction, at once conscious and subconscious, that the product of the old

literary, classical and aristocratic education is not, and cannot be, true knowledge. You will hear doctors and men of science aver that the worst of the educated world in this country, as it has been produced by our system of education, is that one half of it does not even know how the other half thinks. It was but the other day that I heard an eminent man of science relate his experiences in the War, how he was called in to help in a technical question, and found that the politicians and administrators were quite unable to realize the nature of a fact, or the elementary laws of causation. They thought that they could get round facts, and that they could always make them out to be something else. However that may be, it remains true that in the modern world we have on the one hand doctors, engineers, scientific students of every type, who think on definite and precise lines, and who are convinced that journalists, politicians, parsons and schoolmasters are incapable of clear thought, and do not know what reasoning is. It is certainly the business of the education of the future to do away with the unfortunate state of mutual misunderstanding which undoubtedly exists: for it is equally true that the products of a literary education regard the scientific type as limited.

It would be tedious to trace in any detail the many influences which have contributed their share to the shaping of the curriculum, and the definition of the subjects through which the

schools are to carry out their work of education. Agreement has been reached to this extent, that in all secondary schools, whether free and independent, or aided by the State, or provided by the local authority, a curriculum which is roughly the same is being attempted. But it is only a limited agreement, and though the common curriculum offers a good deal of choice, it is possible that it does not offer choice enough. Let it be sufficient to say that it is held to be the business of the schools to give a general education, and that its subject-matter is tripartite: it must involve study of the mother tongue, of a foreign language or languages, and of mathematics and science. This arrangement provides opportunity for the old classical course, and equally finds room for a purely modern course, but it is still possible so to interpret it that science may be totally omitted, just as equally Latin may be wholly left on one side. On the basis of this general education boys are invited later to specialize along the lines for which they are best fitted, but only in the largest schools at present is much real freedom of choice presented. In most, a boy has still to study rather the things that can there be taught than the things for which he himself has most capacity.

So the battle of a century has resolved itself to this, that the old classical tradition maintains itself, but is confined to the few that are fit. The abolition of compulsory Greek has opened the door wide to very many students who have

known none of its discipline. Its danger for the future lies in the present comparative rarity of those who can teach Classics with conviction, and, what has always been its peril, the pedantry of some of its specialists. The other specialized forms of higher education are all of them unformed as yet, and the ideal courses are yet to be formulated. Mathematics, which is of oldest standing, is felt to be in itself too narrowing. History relies too much on memory, on the reproduction of second-hand opinions, and on generalizations which a boy has not experience to make. Modern languages seem somehow or other to lack backbone. Science seems to lead boys to neglect things that matter considerably, such as the power of writing their own language, and an understanding of what history and literature stand for. In all of them the schools are prevented from arriving, or even attempting to arrive, at a real culture that might be imparted through these courses of study, by the high standard of specialization which examiners for scholarships at the University require within the limits of the special subject. And here the schools are paying the piper for the high standard of specialization within narrow limits in Latin and Greek which for so long during the nineteenth century they complacently tolerated, and even gloried in.

Now I know that at this point I might ride off from the issue, and sketch an ideal curriculum, which should be followed by all the schools, and then everything would be well. This is the

favourite method of our friends the scientists. Huxley added to the study of natural science, morals, politics, and sociology, English history and geography, the literature of our own land together with all other literatures, to be learned and understood through translations, and the writing of the mother tongue. Art, too, was thrown in. Mr. Wells would not be at a loss to formulate an even more persuasive list, but it would contain less literature and more biology. But I do not think that the framing of ideal curricula helps much. It matters indeed at school what subjects are taught, but it matters much more how they are taught, and indeed of all the subjects of study which have value in themselves, the most outstanding are probably Latin, and in a somewhat less degree, mathematics. But even these can be taught unintelligently, and made in consequence of little value.

What is the culture that is aimed at in the best tradition of English education? It has been said to be the value of "useless" knowledge, but this phrase has been a borrowing of the weapon of an enemy and the turning of its point against himself. It is rather that no knowledge is "useless." All knowledge is of value in itself and for itself, and that which is useless in the real sense is that which falls short of knowledge. There is here no difference between the student of the humanities and the scientist: both seek to know what is to be known, but the latter has

the advantage of working in a more precise subject-matter, and can more easily test his results. Few men attain to knowledge: most, said Plato, are in a state of opinion. They have impressions, not knowledge: and when my scientific speaker attacked the politicians and administrators of the War, who did not realize the nature of facts, he was really drawing the distinction which Plato drew long ago, a distinction which will, I fear, for long persist, between the men who know and the men who don't know. The end of the good teacher is to put before his pupils the conception of knowledge as intrinsically valuable, the only thing worth having, whether it be knowledge about Greek enclitics, or French syntax, the binomial theorem, or the nature of a gas.

It might be said that true education should never be "vocational," but I should be inclined to demur to so blunt a statement. All education is "vocational" in reference to life and I see no reason why, if the ideal of knowledge for its own sake is preserved, if the general culture of the boy is assured, his further studies should not have direct reference to the special occupation which he is afterwards going to take up. I do not see why these studies may not also be "liberalizing," capable of setting the mind free. But it is not the business of the school, it has never been part of the English tradition, to make boys at school into electrical engineers, or chartered accountants, butchers, bakers, or candlestick-

makers: it is its business to train the mind, give a liberal education, and fit the boy for life, whatever his course is going to be.

A true education will somehow preserve the mental alertness and the eternal curiosity which are characteristic of nearly all healthy children, and by no means so characteristic of the same children when in our present system they have become adolescent. The object of this education will be to train its pupils to ask the right sort of question continually in order that they may be in a position to frame a right judgment. With the ideal of true knowledge should go a continuous seeking for it, and the teacher who does not feel it present, or sees it visibly declining in his pupils, should consider whether the fault does not lie in himself. Boys ought to come up for their lessons with as little hesitation as that with which a man sits down to his work. I borrow this thought from an essay which Edward Bowen contributed sixty odd years ago to a book called *Essays on a Liberal Education*, and I cannot forbear from quoting the succeeding paragraph, since it shows the English tradition from the teacher's side at its best. "This," he says, "is indeed something worth being enthusiastic for. To convince boys that intellectual growth is noble, and intellectual labour happy, that they are travelling on no purposeless errand, mounting higher every step of the way, and may as truly enjoy the toil that lifts them above their former selves, as they enjoy a race or a climb: to help

the culture of their minds by every faculty of moral force, of physical vigour, of memory, of fancy, of humour, of pathos, of banter, that we have ourselves, and lead them to trust in knowledge, to hope for it, to cherish it; this, succeed as it may here, and fail there, quickened as it may be by health, and sympathy, or deadened by fatigue or disappointment, is a work which has in it most of the elements which life needs to give it zest. It is not to be done by putting books before boys, and hearing them so much at a time; or by offering prizes and punishments; or by assuring them that every English gentleman knows Horace. It is by making it certain to the understanding of every one that we think the knowledge worth having ourselves, and mean in every possible way, by versatile oral teaching, by patient guidance, by tone and manner and look, by anger and pity, by determination even to amuse, by frank allowance for dullness and even for indolence, to help them to attain a little of what gives us such pleasure. A man, or an older pupil, can find this help in books: a young boy needs it from the words and gestures of a teacher. There is no fear of loss of dignity. The work of teaching will be respected when the things that are taught, begin to deserve respect."

The words are the words of a great teacher, and they ring true. It will have been noticed how he hammers in the conception of the value of knowledge for its own sake. More than ever

this conception is of value to-day, when the country is flooded with opinions, and every newspaper offers them in unnumbered quantities ready-formed. But there is all the difference in the world between gaining sound knowledge on any subject, and collecting opinions about it. If you have once gained sound knowledge on anything, however limited in range it may be, you have a standard, and you know what knowledge is. And in a world of many opinions you will have the standard which will enable you to judge between them. You will know that you have to ascertain what the facts are, which is in itself not an easy process, and then, facing those facts, and giving to each its proper value, form a deliberate judgment. To ask the right questions, and from the answers to form a right judgment, that is the rare fruit of a good education.

But the realm of knowledge is very wide, and every year its frontiers are advanced. It is now only possible for any individual to know a small portion, but there is no need for undue discouragement in that. It is possible to be very learned without being educated, but true knowledge, even though limited, if rightly applied, fits men for life. That is the justification of the modern curriculum which on the basis of a common general education offers to each boy who is fit for it a specialized course in the subjects for which he has most capacity. It is based on the hope that by the acquisition of true knowledge in one portion of the field, he

will know that it is to be looked for in every other, that opinions based on impressions are a mere shifting mirage, and that what matters for life is sound judgment based on ascertained truth.

CHAPTER VIII

ATHLETICS

I USE the term "athletics" in the sense in which the Greeks used "Gymnastic," and mean by it that which not only produces, and promotes bodily fitness, but also through the training of the body develops the right type of character. As such, it has its very definite and justified place in the English tradition. There is an old Latin tag which says truly that the worst results come from the corruption of what is best, and the extravagancies and stupidities to which athleticism has led in the last fifty years have led many earnest people to believe that it necessarily involves the denial and neglect of higher values, intellectual, æsthetic, and even religious. "He doesn't mind letting it be known that he is a Christian, although he is a Blue," was once said to me long ago by another undergraduate in all simplicity and good faith, and the remark pointed to some disturbance of comparative values in his mind. But again, in this chapter, I shall consider how things have come to be, and what they might be rather than what they are, for I am trying to examine first the nature of the ideal. Before I turn to that task, I would point out that

the society which is devoted to athleticism can equally well be devoted to art, politics, and philosophy, and that this is not a matter of theory, since it was the case with the ancient Greeks. The worship of bodily fitness and bodily beauty was carried by them to an extreme, and the Olympic victor received from his city supreme honour and free maintenance for the rest of his life. The sculptor and the poet combined to glorify him: he was, indeed, "the top of admiration." His athletics were pure individualism, what we should call professionalism. The Greeks had no team-spirit, or sense of combination in their athletics, and so far as I know, they had a remarkably undeveloped sense of honour and fair play: the judges at the Olympic games must have had frequent need to keep their eyes very wide open. The athletes as a class were open to the charge of dullness and even mere animalism, and Euripides, as is well known, had cause to observe in the hey-day of the system that of the ten thousand evils that existed in Hellas, not one was worse than the tribe of athletes. And yet this race, sunk, as some moderns would say, in a morass of debased athleticism, simultaneously was producing in architecture, in art, in drama, poetry, history, and philosophy work of a quality which the whole world has since not often approached, and very rarely equalled. It is, therefore, manifest that even if a low view of athletics prevails, and it is pursued in the wrong spirit, it does not necessarily follow that everything else of good report lies in the dirt.

But English athletics have nothing to do with Greece, even though there exist to-day, unfortunately, as I think, Olympic games: they represent a nobler tradition. They have developed in part, and their best inspiration has come, from the usages of chivalry. It was the ideal of the mediaeval knight to be perfect in all bodily accomplishment, to have a perfect seat on a horse, to shine in the tournament, to endure heat, cold and long-sustained effort without complaint, to be a master of venery and every form of the chase with hound and bird. When manners changed, the form of the athletic training of the aristocrat changed with them, but in spirit remained the same. Tennis was evolved and began a new era in ball-games: swordsmanship and the use of the rapier replaced the crudity of the tilt-yard: field-sports remained, as always, the chief enthusiasm of kings and nobles. Throughout there goes the ideal of skill, courage and obedience to the punctilio of honour. But in part also English athletics are based on a more universal national instinct: they are not only aristocratic, but popular. There were butts on most village greens where the young men learned to shoot an arrow true: there was running and leaping, rough football, fighting and wrestling, the quarter-staff, and a number of pastimes more brutal than those: but throughout them all there were always the rules of the game to be observed, fair play and no favour.

On this stage of development Puritanism inter-

vened with unfortunate results. It brought with it the conception that the body was something emphatically not to be had in honour, that games were an idle wasting of the valuable moments as they slipped by on their way to eternity, and that amusements were a snare of the devil to catch souls in sin. It produced a profound dualism in the nation: to regard men as sinners is one of the best ways of making them sin and doing worse things than they ever intended to do. The excesses of the aristocracy in post-Restoration times, the animalism of the life of the eighteenth-century country squire, may be in large part laid at the door of the Puritans: equally, though it has not been so commonly observed, the growing brutality of the favourite sports of the village and countryside during the same period may be ascribed to the same reason. Those who were respectable were taught to believe that games and merry-making must be put away with all childish things, and so these fell into the hands of those only who were not respectable. As to the poor children in school, the hours of attendance in those ill-lit, uncomfortable, crowded form-rooms are enough to make any human being of to-day shudder in retrospective sympathy: they ran from seven to twelve in summer in some schools, and from one to five: no wonder that boys crept like snails unwillingly to school. No one taught them any games. No one cared. They had their tops and their marbles, their hoops, their balls, their fights, bullyings, and tortures, and occasion-

ally their days in the freedom of the countryside where they were naturally marauders. This mishandling of youth went on for a couple of centuries, and at the end of the eighteenth century Blake could write in "The Schoolboy":

> But to go to school on a summer morn
> O! it drives all joy away.
> Under a cruel eye outworn
> The little ones spend the day
> In sighing and dismay.

I believe that this was almost universally true of school-life, whether in the schools of the aristocracy, or the local grammar schools, or the village schools such as they were. There may be urged against me from the end of this period the often-quoted remark of the Duke of Wellington, that the battle of Waterloo was won on the playing-fields of Eton, but in the first place I am by no means convinced that he ever said it, and in the second I have not the remotest idea to what he was referring, if he did say it, unless it was to those habits of personal pugilism which may have found their outlet on that arena.

At any rate towards the end of the eighteenth century a rude sort of cricket was being played, and rough go-as-you-please types of football were beginning to be indigenous to most schools. But not until the nineteenth century was well on its way did games begin to take a real hold. It is sometimes said that Arnold invented the system as a far-seeing method of overcoming the evils which arise from unoccupied leisure: Arnold did

much, but he did not invent everything. He preferred to see boys playing games where he could stand and watch them rather than that they should be out of his sight, and up to goodness knows what: besides, he liked games, and had something of the boy in him always. He could not otherwise have been the schoolmaster he was. I do not think that games counted for more than this with him. But when his assistant masters became Heads of other schools, as occurred in many cases, they felt that games had been a valuable feature of Rugby life which might well be introduced elsewhere. Cotton went to Marlborough, for instance, to create a school out of mutineers, and he consciously developed organized games as one of the methods by which the school should be brought into order. Parents were written to, and the system was begun. So it spread rapidly from school to school, but few realize at the present day how recent the whole system is. Eton and Harrow had played cricket against one another for some time, but the first inter-school match at Rugby football was between Clifton and Marlborough. I do not remember in what year it took place, but it must have been subsequent to 1861, when Clifton was founded: it roused such hot and intense feelings that for some years it was held that at this game at any rate schools ought not to meet one another on the stricken field. The attitude to games in general was quite different, and in the earlier part of the nineteenth century there were cases

of men who failed to play for their 'Varsity both at cricket and football in the most important contest of the year, because they had other engagements of a more attractive kind, or because they desired to work. *Alia tempora, alii mores.*

As cricket and football spread among the schools, it did not take long for the discerning among the schoolmasters to see that what they had elaborated by accident was not merely an excellent method of letting off physical energy, and occupying spare time, but also a fine educational instrument. What, indeed, they had discovered by accident was the team-spirit, which alone builds character: or rather, I should say, alone strengthens those qualities which we wish to develop. Individual excellence at games has its effect on character too, but rarely in a desirable direction. The thought of the team-spirit is a commonplace to us, but it is a recent arrival in the field of educational thought, and is indeed one of the greatest English contributions to methods of true education. It is, moreover, the spirit which more than any other the world wants in the twentieth century, if it is to accomplish the work which the human race has the opportunity of achieving.

It is not true that any game will do for this purpose. There is rowing, which has great merits. It teaches four or eight people to contribute their individual utmost to a common object: it involves the learning of a more or less common style, and of complete co-ordination in time and rhythm with the stroke: it demands real physical

fitness, much endurance, and "grit." Its defects seem to me to be that it is monotonous, and may be for weeks a "sad mechanic exercise": it involves little or no danger, and makes no demands for instant decisions and reactions: and it cannot be adopted in every school. Far from it, since the navigable rivers of England are few. There is cricket, which is possible for everybody everywhere, hitherto the most valuable of all national games. Its defects are obvious on the surface. It cuts up a great deal of time, occupies long afternoons, and long days: its supreme exponents, as we know, may occupy a week before they arrive at a decision. During the whole of that time nine people will be completely unemployed. But on the other hand the art of cricket is very varied, and demands natural skill and long training: co-operation is the whole spirit of a game, in which each player contributes his own special capacities. The fielding side which is always on its toes, the bowlers who bowl with dogged steadiness or victorious enthusiasm, the incessant demand for tactics and honest guile on the part of captain and bowlers, the continuous watchfulness of the batsmen and the instant decisions which they have to make with every ball that is bowled—all these are features of the game which have hitherto made it supreme, for they mean that eleven men must be thinking of nothing else than how by co-operation to bring about the downfall of an opponent. It is, moreover, a game of surprises and sudden dramatic develop-

ments: at times even it may require a considerable quality of courage, as when a batsman must stand up to a fast bowler in a poor light on a tricky pitch. It is a game which can bring together outside the schools, on village greens everywhere, high and low, all social classes, in easy fellowship, and it has added a new conception of fairness and chivalry to the common stock of our national ideas, since everybody English knows at once what is meant by such statements as "This is cricket" and "That is not cricket." Indeed, its power over the national character can be gauged by the fact that no other game has contributed anything analogous to our moral concepts.

But I am rather inclined to believe that for school purposes, if for no more than school purposes, pride of place will come to be given to Rugby football. It does not occupy much time: an hour and a half will give even the doughtiest champions their fill of the delight of battle. Indeed, the highest physical fitness is required in the conditions of the modern game of those who are able to go their hardest for forty minutes each way. Those who do not know the game may, when they first witness it, describe it in words which have been used to me by such a person, as an obscure form of personal combat. Yet every one of the thirty players has his particular post and duty, in attack and defence, and on his instant carrying out of his function the success of the whole depends. Each must be

quick to take the opportunity of a second: his decisions must be perfectly fearless and perfectly instantaneous. Selfishness, the desire at all costs to shine individually, is the cardinal sin: the ideal game to watch, and to play in, is where fifteen men, moving at top speed, work as a single team, and depend wholly upon combination. Everybody must be prepared to take hard knocks in perfectly good temper, and no game requires more courage than this, the courage, for instance, of hurling yourself fearlessly on the ball when it is at the feet of a rush of opposing forwards. When it becomes "rough" or unfair, the game is ruined: it is one of its many merits that it can only be played by those who are in the only real sense of the word gentlemen. It is a test of character.

There are those, however, who would raise the claims of the rival code of football as the best, because at present it is the most popular game, and who deplore the fact that more and more schools desert Association for Rugby on the ground that it is bringing class distinctions into a national game. Association is a good game, but it is not so good a game as Rugby for the education of boys: it does not require the same speed, endurance, courage, or chivalry. It has, as a game, been almost entirely ruined by the professionalism which dominates it, and professionalism is the complete antithesis to the English tradition of sport. The standard has thereby been raised too high for any but the most excep-

tional amateur to be able to take part in the first-class games, and its spirit has ceased to be that of a game, and become that of a profession of public entertainers who must ultimately think, not of the game, but of the money that is involved in it. Those who cry out that the schools must on no account drop Association are not merely trying to bolt the stable door after the horse has been stolen, but they are doing it several years after the horse has been doing, under their noses, work for which it was not intended. What is to be desired in the interests of the true athletic tradition of this country is that more and more schools should take up Rugby, prove themselves morally and physically fit to play the game in the spirit in which it should be played, and never on any consideration whatever allow a breath of professionalism to come into it.

Hockey is a good game in itself, fast and skilful: it is of most service as a change, for it lacks the great qualities that reside in football and cricket. Lawn tennis, fives, rackets, golf, are also all of them good in their place, good games, but mainly hygienic in their value: they have not character-building value. One has only to compare the individualist activities of a team of golfers with those of a cricket eleven to see at once that this is so. I am not here comparing the value of game with game from the individual's point of view, or even looking at them as methods of keeping fit: from that point of view Swedish Drill may, for all I know, be the most effective

method. I am considering athletics as an educational instrument, as part of the ideal of the English tradition: it is no part of that ideal to use the schools for the production of individual champions in international sport. That is to mistake the true place of games as a preparation for life, and to worship as an end what should only be a means. If Euripides were permitted to return to this world, or could be born again into the present time, I think he would say that of the ten thousand evils that now exist in Britain and America nothing is worse than the world-champions in sport and all that goes to produce them.

The wrong view, the un-English view, of sport, prevails widely, and is cutting deep into the national mind. It is the view that all sport is competitive, designed to be a spectacle of gladiatorial character, and to demonstrate the one team or individual who may be acclaimed as the best. It is the spirit which gloats breathlessly over international contests, and sees the signs of national decadence if England does not win every championship in every game. It would not matter if England did not win any championship in any game. England taught the world to play games, and the spirit in which they should be played. It would be a thousand pities if the world, having learned the less valuable part of the lesson of athletics which England had to teach, should retaliate on us by making us forget that always and everywhere we "must count

the game, and not the prize." It is not for us for the sake of games to lose all the true reasons for playing them. Therefore, to be true to the tradition, the schools of England must continue inflexibly to refuse to be exploited, whether it be a proposal to divide them into provinces, and after playing a competition in each, to have a spectacular bout of semi-finals and finals to ascertain which of them all has the best team at cricket or football, or whether it be a proposal that they should each engage a lawn tennis professional to see to it that Borotra and Lacoste shall not continue to have it all their own way.

All boys should learn to swim, and most boys should learn to box. The first accomplishment is necessary, and the second may be useful. Yet it is not so much on that account that it should be learned as because there are valuable qualities of self-control and resource to be learned through punching and being punched. You may, it is true, be hurt. But that leads me to draw attention to another aspect of the English tradition of athletics, that one element of value in every game, if it is of real value, is just this, that you may get hurt, and you must neither fear nor mind it. It was often said before the War that English boys were becoming soft. Where were the fights of old days? Where the old endurance? And then, just when the young men had been reduced in the eyes of some of their elders into a race of flannell'd fools who

hopped about on tennis-courts, came the War, and exploded the notion that they lacked any portion of the endurance and courage which had marked their ancestors. Dr. W. H. R. Rivers, in his book *Instinct and the Unconscious*, says that the officers stood the strain better than the men and that this was in fact due to the result of their education: it is to be remembered in this connection that an officer had only half as good a chance of surviving the war as a private. "The games and contests," he says, "which make up so large a part of the school curriculum are all directed to enable the boy to meet without manifestation of fear any occasion likely to call forth that emotion. The public-school boy enters the army with a long course of training behind him which enables him successfully to suppress, not only expressions of fear, but also the emotion itself." For this reason I hope that boys in the future will continue to play cricket and football, to ride across country, if they can, hunt, and steeplechase, to ride motor-cycles and to fly, though I know quite well that a certain number will break their necks in the process. But whether I hope it or not, I am quite certain that they will: there is a certain special value in all pursuits where the risks are real, and mistakes are costly.

I have said that I am speaking of the ideal, and what the schools have been striving for in the past fifty years is through games consciously to implant certain ideals of character and conduct. They are these, that a game is to be played for

the game's sake, and that it matters not a button whether it is won or lost, so long as both sides play their best: that no unfair advantage of any sort can ever be taken, and that within those rules no mercy is to be expected, or accepted, or shown by either side: that the lesson to be learned by each individual is the subordination of self in order that he may render his best service as the member of a team in which he relies upon all the rest, and all the rest rely upon him: that finally, never on any account must he show the white feather. If games can be played in that spirit, they are a magnificent preparation for life, if at the same time they can be kept in their proper place, and do not distort the true values. But how far in the past or the present the schools or the nation can fairly claim to have realized this ideal, is another matter: it is something that this is the nation which first conceived it, and it is to the schools that it owes whatever approximation to the best it has been able to make.

CHAPTER IX

SERVICE

THE ideal practical end of education in the later Middle Ages, before the foundations of society were broken up, was that there should never be lacking profitable servants of Church and commonwealth. Neither in Church nor State had the claims of institutions to loyalty been questioned: unrest at times, and insurrection, there might be, but, though there were a few class-conscious malcontents who asked "When Adam delved and Eve span, who was then the gentleman?" opposition was always aroused, not by doctrinaire theories, but by concrete injustice and hardship, and allayed by their remedy. It is too often forgotten that in the mediaeval society the son of the poor man might rise through the Church to be the first subject of the State, and at any rate brains, ability, and industry would carry their owner to position and influence. In such a static society life ran normally, even though it was far from being a golden age. But the position changed very profoundly when the Reformation broke the unity of the Church, and drove beyond the pale large classes of the nation who did not conform to

the Established Church, when at the same time there arose a new landed class who owed their estates to spoliation, and an increasing merchant and trading class whose interests differed from those of the aristocracy. Strife and contention replaced the healthy functioning of classes, and the politics of the ruling classes were devoted to the maintenance and safeguarding of their privileged position. The ideal of service to the Church and State became more and more in practice service to the interests of class, and it is not unjust to say that among large classes of the well-to-do the social creed which was counted as the correct teaching in the eighteenth century was "God bless the squire and his relations, and keep us in our proper stations."

Ideals in that century were out of place, and enthusiasm was bad form, in religion, in politics, in all human relationships, and certainly in education. I do not know what was offered to the children as the guiding principles of their life save a conventional and dead version of Christianity: repression and discipline were their portion. But when the eighteenth-century system had broken up, and the present had begun, when Reform opened the chance of political power to a new class, when life was beginning to return to education, then we find that the ideal that was offered to boys was that they should be Christians and gentlemen. There are many to-day who sneer at Christians, and still more who sneer at gentlemen, and that may, at

any rate, in part be due to the fact that many have in practice fallen very short of the ideal on both its sides. But in itself it was, and is, a noble ideal, and there have been, and are, enough who have lived so worthily according to these standards that they rouse respect, admiration, and emulation in all who are not for one cause or another embittered.

When in the nineteenth century the Chapels began to be a real influence in the life of the schools, this was the ideal which was constantly presented from their pulpits. Life was portrayed not as a sphere of service so much as a scene of duty, and the Englishman showed his true breed if he did not fail in it. It was an ideal of uprightness, honour, and incorruptibility, of the honest governor, the righteous judge, the ruler who should be the father of his people. In the strength of it sterling work was accomplished, in the English countryside, in regiments and ships-of-the-line, and notably in India, where it created the most honourable and successful Civil Service of an alien governing power that the world has seen. It had its influence upon commerce also, and carried throughout the world the conviction that the right sort of Englishman could be trusted. But for all that it was too often based on privilege, a sense of superiority, and there was in it a certain residuum of the prejudices of a social class. It tended to regard trade as "banausic," and living on the funds as more intrinsically respectable than gaining a livelihood by commerce. It was

willing to accept the poor as being "always with us," willing to be kind but firm, to be friendly, but not to put ideas into their heads. Life and the world were not the field of any crusade, but an ordered estate to be managed. The Seine, and all the ideas that had been tossed to and fro by that turbulent stream, were a "red fool fury." And the schools were places in which one instinctively gathered these ideas, and mixed with one's equals. Other fellows went to grammar schools, and then there was all this talk of universal elementary education. Probably the people would be much happier and more contented without it: and yet in these days, expensive as it was, there might be something in it. "We must educate our masters."

And so Thomas Hardy could write in *Life's Little Ironies*, of a boy who had gone to a great public school: "Somehow her boy, with his aristocratic school-knowledge, his grammars, and his aversions, was losing those wide infantine sympathies, extending as far as to the sun and moon themselves, with which he, like other children, had been born, and which his mother, a child of nature herself, had loved in him: he was reducing their compass to a population of a few thousand wealthy and titled people, the mere veneer of a thousand million or so of others who did not interest him at all."

So in practice the upper classes, the gentry, had a fine ideal of personal conduct, though many of them were apt to be just a little stupid

and unimaginative. The commercial and trading class, still largely under the influence of Puritanism, presented to their boys at home and in favoured private academies the ideals of hard work and strict integrity. Mind your book, and pay on the nail, and the Lord will prosper you. It is an ideal which does not deserve all the derision which has been poured upon it. Favoured by fortune, it established the supremacy of English manufacturers, and made the country's commerce world-wide. It placed integrity first. But it was in a narrow sense self-regarding. To many the object of the religious life was presented as the saving of one's individual soul in a highly select company. Others welcomed with enthusiasm the teaching that the survival of the fittest was a beneficent law of a wise God, and that enlightened self-interest was identical in the long run with the highest altruism. It was very convenient. To make a large private fortune was to be a public benefactor, and one could throw oneself without reserve into the affairs of the city.

But as the nineteenth century began to wear on, and the rise of the Chartists vexed the public mind, and the state of prisons and factories and houses was forced on the public attention by reformers who knew how to make themselves heard, new ideas began to stir in the schools, and men who had come from them began here and there to enter the field of social service. It was in 1854 that Maurice started his Working Men's College, but five years earlier he had

started an adult school in a most disorderly and benighted district of London, and Tom Hughes was one of his helpers. That may be regarded as symbolical, for the inspiration derives from Arnold, and that nobler side of the ideal of "Christians and gentlemen" which he so constantly presented. Tom Hughes is a symbol because he is among the first of a long line who have through their school education been inspired by the conception of service, and have sought to realize it by going out to impart something of their ideals, something of their own joy of life, and something of the knowledge that is worth having, to those classes of the community which through the working of the social system and through no fault of their own were given no chance of happiness and no chance of well-being. From such men Oxford House, and Cambridge House, and Toynbee Hall have been recruited, and many a club for men and for boys in the slums. From that inspiration and from that experience it has come about that social work has become an honourable profession with a technique and a science of its own.

In the schools themselves the pioneer, as might be expected, was Thring. It is interesting to see in what ways he caused Uppingham to interpret the ideal of service. "The rich boys must learn to help the poor boys" was his main thought, and less for the sake of the poor boy than for the good of the souls of the rich. Hence, in 1864, Uppingham was helping a Boys' Home for the

destitute, and founding a scholarship at the Blind College at Worcester. Many contributions were being sent from time to time to the mission field in India, in Africa, in New Brunswick. But in 1869 Thring took up the idea of a special school mission in the East End of London, and started work first in Woolwich, then in Poplar. Old boys were the missioners, and the school in large deputations made pilgrimages: and after one such visit these were the words which Thring wrote in his diary: "I less and less set my heart on this Uppingham here and its buildings and the local work. I confess I don't feel much hope for the future, but in the life I trust I do feel an intense faith—in the seed growing somewhere, and this North Woolwich meeting was a kind of visible embodiment of that invisible somewhere, a sort of making known of the life that has gone out and of its world-wide character, as not wanting a place, a locality: as not confined and cribbed to one form or one kind of working. . . . England has never before had this fastening of a school on to real life work in the world outside." It was true, and here rather dimly apprehended, but eagerly felt for, was the conception of a spirit of service and fellowship which might be, not the noble gesture of Uppingham, but something common to all the schools and all education. The seed of Thring's example fell upon fertile ground, and in the next thirty years all the great schools had established their missions, and all of them largely upon his model.

Nevertheless, the school missions did not fulfil all the high hopes which Thring and others had formed and built upon their first promise. From one aspect they succeeded. They built churches and club-rooms, they were the scene of the devoted work of old-boy missioners in many cases, and of a certain number of old boys, their wives and sisters. But they failed to establish a really living link with the school itself, or to exercise much influence on the lives and outlook of boys. In fact there was, and is, a real danger that they may cause boys to believe as a matter of practice that they can compound for their duty of service by an annual subscription. The support of the mission became simply an annual charge which in some cases went down on the bill, and a matter of a formal visit paid once a year by the missioner to the school, and by a representative boy, or boys, to the mission. Quite a number of missions developed into ordinary parishes, and kept no spirit of a mission about them. On the other hand, the rebellious spirit of labour too frequently rejected this whole method of approach. It was in the first place closely connected with the appeal of religion, and labour was secular and non-religious. In the second place the movement was supposed to be imbued with the spirit of patronage, and to be part and parcel of a system which is held to consist at present of two classes only, those who "boss," and those who are "bossed." The politically-minded and class-conscious working

man rejected the whole movement with anger and contempt.

This angry rejection was not altogether fair, for the school tradition had something to give which was worth the taking. The schools met with happier results when they followed the lines which Maurice had pioneered, and in settlements and clubs their old boys combined to give the workers some taste of real education. This is not the place to speak of the work of Toynbee and Barnett, which inspired so many. It succeeded in its day because it offered, not patronage, but fellowship in the seeking of a real education in comparison with the inferior article which was all that the State then offered to the poor. In clubs for men and clubs for boys many an "old boy" transmitted the best of what he had learned at school, and became the friends of those with whom they dwelt. It is to the unseen work done by many thousands in this spirit, a spirit of service which they had learned at school, that England owes the fact that its class-divisions, though grave, have never been soured with the embittered hate which is prevalent in other countries, where moral ideals are not held to be the first concern of education.

Such clubs and such social work should continue, though in rather a different spirit, since times have changed: for one thing, the educational facilities open to the children of the poor are now much improved both in quality and in quantity, and for another, the working-classes

see political power in their grasp. All the more do they need every chance of understanding and absorbing the true ideal. For the boys of the richer schools, talking about service, and paying vicariously for service, are of little good: what does matter, is that service should be personally rendered, and it has to be recognized that for many boys this cannot be a reality until they have left school. Perhaps the most fruitful experiments of the present day are the camps where boys of both social types meet upon equal terms. The Duke of York's camp is well known: it is an annual indication of the friendship which men of goodwill wish to exist, but it is not based on natural and permanent relationships. Of another type is that which is called the Marlborough-Swindon camp, of which I will speak in brief detail because it embodies types of fellowship which typify what may be in our education rather than what is. In the month of August a number of boys who have just left the elementary schools of Swindon come to Marlborough, and are there entertained in the school in groups led by Marlborough boys, each group representing a "House." They have their "House" competitions in games, their chapel services, their common excursions and amusements. They are managed by a committee of Marlborough masters and Swindon elementary masters. During the winter months Marlborough boys go over to the Swindon club, and are there entertained by their former guests. There is a constant human relationship

on terms of equality and respect, a sense of a tradition which can be followed in common. There is an absence of the spirit of patronage. The fact that the whole is maintained by the collaboration of elementary schoolmasters and public-school masters in founding a common ideal, a collaboration which, thanks to the personalities of those engaged in the work, has hitherto been of the happiest, is to me symbolic of the future, when I dream that a united profession of teachers may be of one mind in training generations for service in a spirit that is neither divided nor selfish.

Whatever may be thought of these experiments, it remains true that boys can only be trained to respect the ideal of service if it animates their own education, and is the secret of their own common life. It is the tradition of the schools to bring this about, not merely by ranging the boys themselves in a hierarchy, where the youngest are bound merely to obey, but may look to rise through a series of offices and honours, responsibilities, privileges, and duties to positions of real honour. It is also their aim to impress upon every boy that he has some gift of his own to contribute to the common stock for the enrichment of the life of his " House " or of his school. It may be proficiency in work, or excellence in games: it may be music or art or handicraft: it may be no more than the example of doing his " job," whatever it may be, with unfailing good temper. But he owes something to the community's life,

and the boy that walks by himself is made to feel that in him there is something lacking. In the task of self-development and the difficult process of self-realization at school the boy comes instinctively to feel that he is nothing apart from the community of which he is a member. That is the way in which the instinct to service is most healthily developed, but it is the task of the school to see that it does not stop within limits that are too narrow, the limits of the House, the limits of the school, the limits of a social class. It is a hard task at school to give this wider outlook, partly because there is not yet in existence between school and school that fellowship in a spirit of equality which would prove the best hope of the future. In this atmosphere the school should present life to each individual as something to be lived in the spirit of adventure, a quest, almost a crusade, in which he is to use opportunity and circumstance to build character, an undivided, undistracted personality, something which must always be lived under social conditions in terms of a community existence, so that his neighbours must always matter to him, and he to his neighbours. In such a school there might come about an approximation to the ideal in praise of which the great schoolmaster, Percival, poured out the inner yearning of his soul in his sermon at Clifton College Jubilee : " I still dream of the time when from some school, under some influence which as yet we know not, there shall go forth year by year a new genera-

tion of men, who shall be characterized not merely by some social, athletic, or literary accomplishment, some conventional varnish or culture, but by a combination of gifts and strength and moral purpose, which shall stamp them as prominent workers, if not as leaders and prophets in the next stage of our country's evolutionary progress. There is still abundant room, to say nothing of the crying need, for these social missionaries of a new type, who shall be men of simple and pure tastes, the declared enemy of luxury and self-indulgence and greed, whether vulgar or refined; men in whom public spirit, public duty and social purpose shall be practicable and guiding motives, not vague and intermittent sentiments; men who shall feel the call to alter the conditions of life, and remove the manifold temptations which are working so destructively among the multitudes of our poorer classes; men, who with all this, are not bigoted, but who realize that earnestness of purpose and a tolerant spirit are not incompatible, and above all men whose life shall be guided by a serious and humble and reverent spirit, who may fairly be described as true Christian citizens—strong, faithful and not afraid."

It may be argued that, when all is said and done, the ideal of service which is supposed to be the inspiration of the English school tradition, is no more than the love of God and the love of our neighbour, long ago set forth in that straightforward document, the Church Catechism. It *is* the love of God and the love of one's neighbour,

it is an old inspiration recaptured, the words of Christ better understood than at various periods of our national history they have been understood in Church or nation. It may appeal to one individual as a call to the building of the kingdom of God, to another in the more humdrum form of learning to do his duty in that state of life unto which it shall please God to call him, to a third it may be just solid service, and no more. But it is something which can inspire him whatever his social position, and whatever his walk in life, so to live for himself and his neighbours that the world may be by a little the better place because of the fact that he has passed through it. It is not an ideal which is aristocratic in itself or in natural range, save so far as we may think in terms of a moral aristocracy: men so inspired, who live consistently, would be the salt of the earth. It is applicable to the boys of every school that there is.

What other ideals can education offer to its pupils at the present day? It can bid them, as for a long time it did bid them, so to live as to save their own souls. The world has discarded, and finally discarded, that conception of God which caused the instinct of self-preservation to seem the dominant instinct of the individual's life. To the picture of Hell, and of God the Just Tormentor, the world will not listen: it will go by with a smile on the opposite side of the way. But to the doctrine that you cannot

distinguish between the actions which are self-regarding, and those which are society-regarding, and that all our actions must have eternal consequences, and are bound up for ever with the lives of ourselves and our neighbours, it will listen and pay heed. Education might bid boys, less unselfishly, to go forth in order to save the souls of other people, and that, too, has been a pursuit which has persuaded many: the finder of the lost sheep is an attractive figure. But too often that way in the past has lain the path to self-righteousness, and self-deception, nor has humanity been able to recognize in the "saved" or the "saver" the qualities which should have been obvious. It will rather ask boys to take up their membership of a society, to look on life as an adventure of co-operation, to regard morality among other things as a duty which they owe to their neighbour, and not to let the society down. Whether they be members of a Christian Church or not, it is an ideal which they can follow, but it is an ideal of richer content, if they can accept as God Christ Who inspired it, and Who founded the society.

What other ideals does the world offer to-day? Is it to be the Will to Power, with which Nietzsche for a time bemused the Continent? He who would preach this as a doctrine to English schoolboys would underrate their sense of humour. Power to do what? Most of them know full well to what results in the world the Will to Power has led. Or is it to be one of the many

forms of self-development, with which the intelligentsia of to-day is playing, as if the self were the measure of everything, and all that is of ultimate value. Enlightened self-development, even though it can overleap morality, and sublimate the Commandments into something nearer to the heart's desire, is an appeal of no power to move men: however cleverly it is argued, however attractively its ideal is dressed up, it rouses no response from the children of a race which has advanced far enough on the road of man's progress to know that unselfishness is the first quality required for the higher life, and that to call unselfishness merely a form of enlightened selfishness is an idle playing with words. "Lo! I am among you as He that serveth" is simple and direct, and stirs at once to the higher life: it is in those accents that the English tradition of education, if it is true to itself, will continue to speak.

PART II

THE SCHOOLS AS THEY ARE

CHAPTER X

SECONDARY BOARDING-SCHOOLS

THE boarding-schools of the country, both of the first and the second rank, are at the present time enjoying a period of unexampled prosperity. Applicants crowd to their doors, and parents sue humbly for the admission of their sons. They house themselves in buildings of increasing convenience and splendour, and lay out playing-fields with an elaboration which would astonish even our immediate forerunners. Every school can regard itself as singularly successful, and the number of Headmasters, whom in their own presence I have heard described as great, is, when I come to count them, quite astonishing. If there were truth in the old Greek belief that prosperity begets the spirit of insolence, and arouses the envy of the gods, that triumph precedes downfall, there would be reason for the "public schools" to quake, and in the spirit in which Polycrates hurled his most valuable ring into the sea, they might, for instance, transfer Eton to the Buckinghamshire County Council. But I do not doubt that just as the sea returned the ring, so would the Buckinghamshire County Council quickly return Eton.

Let it be sufficient to note that the Dean of St. Paul's, to whom has fallen the function of being the male Cassandra of our generation, has prophesied that the public schools will not survive to the end of the twentieth century. If that be true, let us hope that it will only be so because they are re-born under a still nobler form.

Of the reasons for their success some are good and praiseworthy, and some are less admirable. Their friends and champions select the former for mention, and ignore the latter: their enemies, who are, if not many, at least shrill and bitter, do the opposite. The schools are successful, because on the whole they do what they profess to do: they "deliver the goods." They impart a character which is consistent, and can be trusted. They do not do this in every case, but in a sufficient number, considering the imperfections of humanity, to make the proposition demonstrably true. They are successful because the nation as a whole, very slowly during the nineteenth century, but quite rapidly since the opening of the twentieth, has acquired a sense of the value of education, and a more enlightened notion of what education really is. It has judged that, for those who can afford it, this is the most desirable form of education that is to be got. These are the reasons which are good and praiseworthy, and they are sufficient. It is a less admirable and happy reason that since 1906 there has been from the day-schools a steady transfer of a good type of boy, whose parents forty years ago would have

been quite content to send him to the local school. The sons of the local doctors, lawyers, parsons, and prosperous business men used to be found in the day-school of their native place: they are now largely in boarding-schools. When the day-schools were quite rightly opened to the "free-placer" and "ex-elementary" scholar, there began at once to operate the law by which the worse drives out the better currency, worse and better being understood to have meaning here in terms of the standards of class distinction, or, if you like, snobbery. The parents were not moved by any objection to the admission of the children of the poorer to the benefits of education, or any real belief that these children were of lower moral tone than their own: but they were quite determined that their own children should not "pick up an accent." This is one of the plain governing facts of our social system to-day, and if anyone doubts it, let him ask himself honestly, whether or no he draws any deductions from the manner in which an acquaintance or visitor pronounces the words "round the town" or "strange change," and whether these have weight with him. These are facts which we usually pass by in discreet silence, and it is neither popular nor pleasant to refer to them. But no good whatever is done by concealing their existence or minimizing their importance. At any rate, the Liberal Party, when they opened the schools to the people, and enforced the system of free places, did very effectively something

which they never had in mind: they created a "boom" in the public schools. Other less praiseworthy reasons for the success of these schools are that they confer a social badge, and they give easy rights of entry to circles which people do as a matter of fact very much desire to enter. I think it is in *Sinister Street* that the hero relates that when, as a freshman at Magdalen, he was in the company of undergraduates fresh from the public schools, and, being asked where he came from, gave the name of a day-school, there was an immediate hush as if he had said he was illegitimate. So long as day-school boys are foolish enough to go up to the University with a social inferiority-complex of this sort, so long the shrewd parent will willingly pay to send his son to the boarding-school. And then there is the compelling force of fashion, perhaps the strongest of all, when a system is once fully established in popular favour.

When Peter's father in *Joan and Peter* is represented by Mr. H. G. Wells as wandering round on his tour of inspection from one great school to another, when he sees their beautiful buildings, and elaborate provision for many needs, he fails to find their spirit or animating purpose, and vaguely wonders what they are after, what they think they are trying to do. I have tried in the first part of this book to say what they are trying to do, and it is fair to make the further claim that all the schools are not trying to do it in the same way. They have in them that proof

of vitality which consists in variety and the power to make experiment. Gresham's School, Holt, under Howson, and Oundle under Sanderson, are very recent examples of a system varied to realize a conscious end, which has from time to time been characteristic of this type of education since the days of Arnold. And if these schools fall short, the answer is that of course they fall short, for there is not a single school in the country which is all that it might be, or fully realizing its aim. The boarding-schools, just because they aim at the highest, seem to their enemies to fall lowest, and they are in addition subjected to attacks that are bitter and unfair. Now it is the worst set in the worst "House" that in some school novel is held up as typical of the whole system, now it is smug masters who are represented as tolerating and hushing up sin and profligacy for the sake of social position and emoluments, or again the schools are painted as a system of merely stupid athleticism. To this kind of attack I shall not endeavour to pay the compliment of an answer, for the only possible treatment is the answer of silent contempt.

It is, as Burke said, a difficult thing to draw an indictment against a nation, and it is as difficult to generalize about the boarding-schools of the country with any fairness. They are fed by several hundred Preparatory Schools which train their pupils up to the age of fourteen at most. If the standard of the best of these were taken

as typical, the system would be quite admirable: if they were characterized by their lowest examples, it would be hard to condemn the system too strongly. Anybody may open a Preparatory School: he may engage in the work for the sake of education, or for the sake of commercial success: fortunes are to be made by the lucky and industrious. He will not be subjected to inspection, and the sole test of his work will be whether or no his pupils can pass into the Public Schools. He will tend to omit, therefore, everything from his curriculum which has no examination value, and, if he is not an educationist, he will teach what has examination value, and teach it rather stupidly. He will in any case be hampered by the difficulty which he will find in securing competent assistants, for the work of an assistant in a Preparatory School is laborious, and at times irksome and petty, a compound of the tasks of the teacher, the nurse-companion, and the games professional: it does not carry a high salary, generally no pension, little social status, and certainly no future. The field of Preparatory education is probably that in which the most useful work waits to be done. Some means ought to be found for removing the incompetence of the worst without impairing the freedom of the best, some steps ought to be taken towards making the career of any teacher in such schools of equal emolument and prospects with that of any other teacher, some plan adopted for training them to teach. Yet even under all

these handicaps the best of them are very good, and, it may be added, apt to be very expensive. The only criticism which may truly be levelled against some of the best and the most conscientious is that they dominate too much the growing personalities of the boys, and an over-enthusiastic master, who has by his own charm and personality won the affection of his pupils, and with it dominion over them, forgets that these little pupils have souls of their own, and that it is not the highest form of education virtually to try to force these to develop into replicas of himself.

Nor can the masters of the public schools towards which these institutions look justly escape all criticism. Here again I am drawing no general indictment: I am trying to point out what may be, and what often is. There are those who join the staffs of public schools because for them it is the line of least resistance, because the holidays are long, there is ample opportunity for playing games, and the company is congenial. These are the men who do not study education, though it is nominally their life's work, but hand on a rule-of-thumb tradition. They are ignorant not only of other systems of education, but of other parts of the system of their own country: they have a dim idea that all other schools are some form of Board Schools, a term which they retain from the vague impressions of their youth. They may have seen no school but the one in which they are, nor had any other experience save three or four years at Oxford or

Cambridge. For all the higher ends of the school ideal these develop into the "defeatist" section of the staff, for the thing which has been, it is that which shall be, and after all, they say, it is a jolly good system. Games remain with them, what they always have been, their chief interest. One such, on the last morning of a term, told his colleagues that he was going to make a serious attempt in the holidays to master his worst faults: he was going to take away with him a good handbook on "Bridge," and only his iron clubs. Such are not typical of the public-school masters as a whole, but they are to be found—too commonly.

Of the masters as a whole it can be said with truth that there is no class of the community which is animated by higher or more unselfish ideals, and that many devote quite contentedly to the work of education gifts which would have carried them far in other fields. Yet often by the circumstances of the case their life is too narrow. They are devoted to the school, their forms, their "Houses": there is often no life outside these save that of the village or the little country-town. They have no leisure, or think that they have no leisure, for public duties, and they do not keep themselves abreast of knowledge in their own subject, or in touch with wider life. They get into a "groove." The atmosphere of a Common Room, especially if a large number of bachelor masters live and eat there for years, can in individual cases reach incredible depths of pettiness. And all that follows from narrowness

of life and restriction of outlook is bound to react upon the boys, and to limit the power of the school.

If we turn to the elements of the ideal which I have attempted to portray, and ask to what extent the schools, as they are, approximate to them, I shall not say much about the first and fundamental element of religion, having already written at length. Generalization is both impossible and foolish: where the religious influence goes deepest, it is often most unseen. It is said that the Public Schools impart merely the religion of good form, form being interpreted as the conventional rules of one small class, at most, good conduct. It is certainly true that it does not produce in large numbers boys who confessedly and avowedly put religion first, but does anybody expect that it should? Is such a result to be expected in any seminary save that which is definitely a training for the religious life? I can but repeat my own belief that, taken as schools of churchmanship, I had almost written, churchiness and ecclesiasticism, the schools are clearly a failure: they do not produce the ecclesiastically-minded laymen, and most people, and not least the clergy, must be glad that they do not. But as systems in which the call of religion is so presented that it does take a real hold on the lives of many individuals, and exercises some sort of influence, even though it may be transitory, upon practically all, then I believe that the schools justify themselves, though it be

in a service where the doers, when all is done, can but be unprofitable servants.

The theory of discipline which holds the schools together has been described, and on the whole it is realized and fulfilled in practice in most schools to a notable extent. As the old severities disappear, it becomes more and more a way of life in which all willingly concur, and passes into the higher condition which, to borrow a theological phrase, may be described as "freedom from the law by the spirit of adoption." But it does not always work so easily, and a multitude of punishments is a sign that the system is not working well. There are still those who rule by a tariff of penalties nicely graduated from small to great, and still Houses which put the boys of the first and second year through a pretty severe apprenticeship for no better reason than because it always has been so, and it is good for the young to be broken in. There is an ever-present danger that the senior boys may not be thinking of their responsibilities, or of the well-being of the younger, but mainly of their own powers and privileges, especially if they have been through a bad time, and feel that they have the chance of taking it out of their successors. This is the weak side of the school system, from which all schools have not shaken themselves free: it is human nature that causes this weakness to show itself from time to time, though some will say that it is in the nature of aristocracies to be corrupt, and public-school discipline, being in

origin and conception aristocratic, is only true to type in the faults which it displays. But these faults are not incurable : they are due ultimately to the unimaginative or indifferent housemaster who lets a system harden into a routine, and judges by, and is content with, purely external conformities.

On the side of culture the schools are less convincing, and further from their ideal. Plenty of good sound honest work is done in them, and very high standards are reached by individuals. School cannot fairly be compared with school, since some schools recruit from boys of a higher intellectual level than others, and some by means of rich scholarship endowments are enabled to attract from the open market a sufficient number of exceptionally clever boys, by whom they do their duty, and secure their reputation. So it may well follow that a school that does not shine in the open competitions for scholarships at the University may for all that be doing sounder work than some schools which do. But, however that may be, the question is whether the public school is successful in imparting to the average boy a sense of the value of knowledge and of the way to acquire it ? It is not possible with honesty to return a confident affirmative answer, and though it is easy to say that we are a practical, and not a theoretic, nation, and that the schools are necessarily a reflection of the national mind on this subject, no one can feel that this is a particularly satisfactory answer, or one with

which we should sit down and be content. I remember Professor A. N. Whitehead once saying in my presence, that the typical product of the public school was a boy who had learned to be ignorant in a considerable variety of subjects, and though the remark irked me at the time, and though the Professor had at that time a strangely exaggerated conception of the mental capacity of the average boy, yet honesty compels me to confess that I for one own that there is a good deal of truth in his description. It is "a sting which bids nor sit, nor stand, but go," and it is worth while to consider what are the reasons for this state of things.

I should say that the majority of boys arrive at their Public Schools with their values wrong: they have a very exalted idea of the value of athletic excellence, and hardly any conception of the value of intellectual achievement. For some time I made it my business at Marlborough to gather the views of new boys by means of essays written on these topics, and it is to be remembered that the writers were rather above the intellectual average than below it: with hardly an exception they regarded the Eleven and the Fifteen as the ultimate end of all desire, and work was at best a thing that had got to be done. This state of mind was doubtless due to the Preparatory Schools, to their fathers and mothers, brothers, sisters, cousins, and aunts, and to the newspapers and magazines, in other words, to the national attitude upon this question.

It could not have been so universal, or so naïve as it was, if this were not the case. But it was not a promising foundation on which to build. In addition, quite a large number had been badly, and some of them stupidly, taught, particularly in Latin and Mathematics. They had proceeded to higher work before they had understood the elements: they had tried, and even been encouraged, to substitute memory for reason and observation: they were in a thorough muddle, and work was unintelligible to them. They did not know why they were doing it, nor what they were attempting to achieve: they did know that it was something which one day they would have to "pass exams in." They were in that parlous condition that they could neither go back to the beginning, because they felt that "they had done it all before," nor could they do the work at the stage which they were supposed to have reached because they understood little of what underlay it. They were therefore ripe for the ministrations of "specials" or "private tutors," who might attend carefully to the process of re-cramming.

It is supposed in some quarters to be unkind, unfair, and unjust to draw attention to these things, but I propose to go on drawing attention to these facts until I cease to observe them. Am I suggesting that this is all due to the weakness and faults of the Preparatory Schools, and that all becomes well when the boys pass to the finer atmosphere of the Public Schools? Not for

a moment do I draw any distinction so unfair. The confused state of the boys' minds, their indifference to knowledge, arise, in fact at any rate, because they have been taught to pass a Common Entrance Examination at all costs, and exactly the same process is in spirit continued in the lower half of the Public Schools, the goal being now the School Certificate. The results are not so bad, for the teachers are better, and an external examination at sixteen and a half is far more reasonable than the same sort of test at thirteen and a half. But work continues to be presented to the average boy as the process of collecting a sufficient number of facts, methods, and dodges to satisfy an examiner, and it is not altogether the fault of the master, or of the boy, but of the system that the latter emerges from his school career with little conception of culture, "ignorant in a good many subjects," and that his main interests continue to be, where they have always been, on the playing-fields. But on this subject I shall have more to say later, for the effects of the system go very far.

It may naturally be expected that a very different account will have to be rendered of that side of the tradition which is concerned with athletics, and that is true. But just as on the side of culture the faults which had to be registered were faults of defect, so on the side of athletics there are to be noted grave faults of excess. It is here by no means entirely the fault of the schools: they are often the unwilling

victims of almost overwhelming pressure from without. Most boys to-day tend to leave their schools with less crude views of the worth of athletics than they brought with them, and a juster sense of the nature of the ideal: they know at any rate that games are not everything. But who shall enlighten the stupid, or touch to finer issues the healthy animal? When I was an undergraduate, I heard an animated discussion carried on by average ex-public-school men on the question whether it was a better and a finer thing to win a Rowing Blue or to be Prime Minister, and they were not exceptionally crass: in those days there were many circles at Oxford in which to start any topic of conversation save sport was to be accounted odd. It is the sons of that generation that the Public Schools are educating now, and I can at least say that they are not such fools as their fathers: but the schools will continue to pay for the sin of over-athleticism, by which I mean the attachment of wrong values to athletics, to the third and fourth generation. Quite recently I heard that it had been maintained by an intelligent member added to society by a Public School that it was in all ways a better and more glorious thing to have made a century at Lord's than to have won the Victoria Cross. It has to be admitted with some sense of shame that all cannot be well with an ideal when it breeds such extravagantly wrong values in the minds of the unintelligent, and that there was more

justification than it is popular to admit in the attack which Kipling was moved to deliver on the "muddied oafs and the flannell'd fools."

The schools are not their own masters, for the ideal for which they seek to stand is apparently barely known to the Press, and at all points they are liable to be betrayed. It was not so many years ago that *The Times*, the acknowledged leading daily paper of this country, published the individual portrait of every member of the Eton and Harrow Elevens. Is it surprising that boys' heads should be turned? Every day and every week the doings of school athletes are chronicled here and there in the Press as if they were matters of very great interest, and stress is laid the whole time on individual performance. Yet the boys themselves are healthy enough, and do not themselves desire this publicity. The result for them is that what was intended to be a game fought out in the old English spirit becomes a long-continued strain which dulls their work, and robs them of sleep, which becomes indeed a virtual slavery. How many a natural and unconscious boy-athlete has been spoiled by the comments of the wiseacres of the Press Box who have published to the world his faults or his virtues, so that he becomes self-conscious and awkward! Partly all this is the result of over-athleticism in the past: partly it has come to us from the United States: and partly, it is the contribution of that section of the Press which has devoted itself to the science and technique

of "stunts," and applied them to the world of sport. Who that has read the newspapers on the recent Test Matches in Australia, the floods of nonsense at first devoted to demonstrating that England had no bowlers to get the Australians out, and no batsmen who could really make runs against bowlers whom the writers had never seen, and could not estimate, if they had, and then the floods of nonsense which accompanied the complete victory of England in the first three Tests, can think that this is a healthy atmosphere in which to teach boys what games really are?

It is not possible for the schools to control these increasing spates of hysterical verbiage, nor altogether to escape from the effects which they have on the minds of their readers. But there are directions in which the schools could live more worthily up to the ideal which they profess, and they have mostly themselves to blame for failure. I have said that the educational value of games lies in the unselfish team spirit which they promote. But put the practical question to any group of boys, and ask them which really in their heart of hearts they would prefer, to make a duck themselves, and have their side win, or to make a century, and have their side lose, and I do not think that you would find very many who would choose the path of self-sacrifice. In cricket particularly the lime-light is thrown upon the individual: individual performance gives honour and glory at the moment, the applause

all round the field, as the batsman or bowler feels, is for him, and not for the team: individual performance gives status in the school afterwards, in a moment of time transforms the nobody into a "blood," and offers to the lips the heady cup of adulation. It was no Puritanical opponent of games who said to me once that I might talk of the character-forming qualities of cricket, but cricket was a game which had ruined as many characters as it had made. If this is so, it is not the fault of cricket: it is the fault of the way in which it is played. Again, it is supposed to be the case, and it is certainly a fact of the English tradition, that the game is the thing, and that it does not matter whether it is won or lost, so long as both sides go "all out," and do their utmost under the strict conditions of fair play. Well, the Public Schools always play fair, and there are many tricks, counted quite legitimate outside them, which are never thought of inside them. But we are most of us familiar with the public-school athlete, not typical, indeed, but to be found in sufficient numbers, who is a very fine player, but an exceedingly bad loser: we most of us know Housemasters who cannot bear to be spoken to, if their House is in process of losing, or has lost, an important game, who shut themselves from the sight of men: I have even seen a school desert the touchline, and silently steal away, because their side was not winning, and they could not bear it. There is continual danger that the old cry of "Play the

game, and never mind whether you win or lose" may be converted into "Win, if you can, draw, if you can't, but for Heaven's sake, don't lose." And that would bring some unpleasant results with it, which have at any rate not occurred yet.

It is hard, finally, to speak of the ideal of service, and of the extent to which it is being realized. Within the school it is realized: the boy who devotes himself entirely to the cause, whatever it may be, that claims his allegiance, is common enough, and the schools have every right to be proud of the fact that he is common. It is said, however, that of the days which follow school the account cannot be so favourable: the Territorial Colonel has to hunt for young officers, the Scouts for Scoutmasters, the Clubs for club-workers and managers, and they all of them go short, while the golf-courses and ball-rooms are full of just the sort of man that they want. I am not yet persuaded that these laments are justified. A nation cannot lose a million men in the field of war, and not feel the gaps for many years afterwards, particularly when the men who sacrificed their lives were the flower of those who would to-day be in their "thirties." The men who have just left school have a great deal to do, even though on Saturdays and Sundays, and festive occasions, they seem to be idling. If the education of the schools does not lead to a sense of the value of the ideal of service in giving to life a worthy meaning, and to a determination to render that service, then it will indeed have

failed, for it aims at no other purpose. It was Burke who spoke of learning patriotism by platoons, who envisaged the family group, and then in steady succession the ever-widening social groups which claim our devotion. It is obvious that if the schools only start a process which stops short at an early stage, they will achieve only very partial results. And there are schools where the House counts for more than the School a thing which is not altogether healthy, and it is true of some, though very far from all, public-school boys, that, when they leave, their sympathies are confined entirely to their own social class. Even so, these are men who would do their duty by the men whom they employ, or lead, or by any who depend on them. I am very far from feeling that on the side of services the boarding-schools can be justly accused of failure.

I have tried to set down defects dispassionately, and to dispel the belief that because the boarding-schools are outwardly successful, they are inwardly content, and ready to deny the need of progress. I quite realize that experience, though wide, cannot in the case of any one person be wide enough to give certainty to the judgments which he passes, and I can only claim that what I have set down here, whether typically true or not, are things which I have seen and heard, not read about, things which I have learned not at second-hand, but by taking part in them myself.

CHAPTER XI

SECONDARY DAY-SCHOOLS

THE secondary day-schools cover a very wide range of diversity of type. In some cases they are hoary with antiquity, in others they are the creation of yesterday: in some they are, and have long been, closely attached to a University, and draw their inspiration from it: in others they are an extension of the elementary school. It is a far cry from Westminster, St. Paul's, or Merchant Taylors' to the new municipal school planted on a suburban site in a district which ten years ago was all fields, and has in that space of time been transformed into a hastily-built dormitory for city workers, but it is a distance which can be covered. The ideal can be as fruitful in the new soil as it has been in the old, even though political and professional prejudices, born largely of mutual misunderstanding and lack of mutual acquaintance, may seem to stand as obstacles to progress at times almost insurmountable.

It has been indicated already that the great day-schools belong by natural right of origin and growth to the old tradition. The Public Schools Commission of 1861 dealt with nine schools, and

of these three were schools wholly or in the main for day-boys, Westminster, St. Paul's, and Merchant Taylors', for that reason mentioned as typical in the preceding paragraph. In the revival of education which had taken place in the nineteenth century, these schools, and others like them, were revived and fertilized by the same ideals as those which were stirring in the boarding-schools, and notably in Rugby. Thence came Prince Lee to King Edward's School, Birmingham, Walker to Manchester and St. Paul's, and Philpotts to Bedford. A similar change took place in Leeds, Bradford, Bristol, and other old schools in large cities: the discipline of the classical culture was made real, an atmosphere of eager work and industry was created, and the schools looked with one accord to Oxford and Cambridge. Things have often changed a good deal since those closing days of the nineteenth century. But looking back on what was to be learned in one that was not of the least famous in their number, I personally have reason to recognize with gratitude that it put before us a high standard of industry, and a real conception of culture based on respect for knowledge. I do not think that there was any clear presentation to us of the ideal of service so much as a call not to let other schools or other people beat us. We were trained to face the full rigours of competition, and left for the most part with a real determination to get on in the world. That this was so, was due to the fact that the religious

appeal was largely absent from our lives: formal prayers each morning, a service on Ash Wednesday when we rather enjoyed assisting in the distribution of curses through the medium of the Commination service, and Confirmation, for which we were prepared by writing notes on the history of the Church and its doctrine, were the only avenues through which the school offered us the means of approach, and we found there nothing to live on. Little attempt was made to develop all that side of discipline which trains boys by giving to them increasing responsibilities. The athletic life of the school was still more limited owing to lack of time, to restriction of space, and distance of grounds, and the greater part of the school took no part in it whatever. Still, if trees are to be judged by their fruits, and there is no other test which is of any value, in education or anything else, then the results of the training given by this and similar schools, as shown in the lives and careers of their former scholars in Church and State, are at least sufficiently notable to warrant the conclusion that there was something vital in the education which they provided.

The smaller grammar schools were not thriving at any time in the nineteenth century, though they continued to exist and in some cases to improve. But they lacked resources, and, what was worse, they lacked hope. Headmasters lived insecurely, and their assistants were miserably paid. It is approximately true to say that there was little chance offered to an able boy of going

far, if in the nineteenth century he lived in a small town or a country district. It is unnecessary to trace here the steps by which all this has been changed, largely as a result of the Act of 1902; it is sufficient to point out that the country is covered by an increasing network of secondary schools created by the activity of County and City Education Authorities, and stimulated, inspected, and aided by the State. Roughly the number of schools has more than doubled, and if regard be had to the old schools which were rescued from inefficiency and decay, the proportion of new to old is considerably greater. On the whole these newer schools are shy of the old tradition, and regard themselves rather as extensions of the State system of elementary education. They have been officially guided, and to some extent inspired, by the Board's Regulations for Secondary Schools: they are inclined to judge themselves by external tests, a good inspection report, a good examination result, and other things that can be measured in an office: they are apt to feel that they are not encouraged to try for things that are more intangible, and possibly of more value. Their Governing Bodies cease to be really independent, or cease to exist altogether, and the Headmasters must go hat in hand to the permanent education official of the Local Authority, by whatever title he may be called.

Of course the division must not be taken as clear-cut: there are almost infinite grades of distinction, of individuality and independence,

between school and school. But it is clear that this tradition of education, for it is already becoming such, is of a species quite distinct from that older one which we have been considering. It is as if two tides from opposite channels had been admitted to submerge a vacant space. They have now met, and the ground is covered. But the waters show manifest traces of the different channels through which they have flowed, and of the sources from which they have come, and the question is, whether they will ultimately mix and combine. The unhappy result which concerns me in my present argument is that there is estrangement between one type of schoolmaster, and another, for which there is no just ground, so that often they do not understand one another. The sad thing about it is that it is all as unnecessary as it is unintentional. The boarding-school master does not mean to hold aloof in most cases, but he is more ignorant and therefore more tactless than he need be: the day-school master stands on his dignity, and is "easily riz": and both are remote from the National Union of Teachers, the boarding-school master, because frequently he quite honestly does not know what it is, and the day-school master, because among other things he thinks it a lower social service. Each part of the profession tends accordingly to belittle the achievement and the standards of the rest. Even Mr. Cholmeley, whose services to the whole profession have made him to be trusted by all its members, when lecturing recently

on the day-school, took occasion to go out of his way to condemn the philosophy of the boarding-school as a philosophy of the well-to-do. The well-to-do, he said, look out on the world from a fortress, and whatever may be done, the spirit of a fortress will endure. This is the subconscious effect of the spirit of division which so subtly divides the profession, and cannot see in another type of school a common tradition to be shared, or another and different manifestation of the one spirit which might animate all. We all of us need in this matter to repent, to clothe ourselves with a new mind.

These differences materialize in the shape of institutions in those associations in which schoolmasters discuss their politics. Thring started the Headmasters' Conference, though he was looked upon askance by the Headmasters of the chief schools. It has become a very different body from that which he intended. The worst feature of it is that membership is supposed to confer upon a school the rank of Public School, and in this way it perpetuates against its own will a class distinction which can do little but harm. It is true that most of its members are members also of the Association of Headmasters, to which all and sundry may belong, but this does not get over the difficulty that Headmasters are divided into two classes, and that the ground of distinction is at bottom taken to be social. Probably one of the best things that could happen for the future of English education would be that

the Headmasters' Conference should cease to exist, and reappear as a Boarding School Committee of the Headmasters' Association. I doubt very much whether this will happen. For it possesses property : it has a history : it is already something that has come down from the past, and Englishmen are notoriously tender with historical survivals. The Assistant Masters have done better in so far as they have only one Association ; yet the National Union of Teachers has for some time had its secondary branch, though the ground was already covered. Again, in origin, the distinction between this branch and the Assistant Masters' Association seems to be at bottom social. There ought to be but one Association for Headmasters, and one for Assistant Masters, to deal with the affairs of the profession as a whole in the field of secondary education. Other associations should be concerned with the subjects which different masters teach, for these do nothing but good. But we shall never arrive at a single spirit and a common ideal so long as we pitch our tents in separate camps, and do not extend full sympathy and favourable construction to one another.

While I still dwell on the unpleasant topic of the activity of Satan in sowing the seeds of division among the members of the teaching profession, I must call attention to the wrong-headedness of the jealousies between school and school. This is, I suppose, thoroughly English, and individualist : but it is the spirit of retail

tradesmen who are keeping rival shops, and not the spirit of a great profession engaged in a single common task. There seems often to be an instinctive feeling that, if my neighbour increases, I must decrease, and then comes the temptation to which it is so easy to succumb, the temptation of suggesting that the increase of my neighbour is due to my neighbour's unworthy methods. In this way the school of old foundation in a city regards with suspicion the new creations of the city education authority, and both tend to condemn the new Central Schools as pretending to offer secondary education, but palming off an inferior article. Yet the task is one, and there is work enough for all: what a difference it would make to the whole work of secondary education, if one New Year's Day every secondary teacher made the resolve "I will not this year criticize my neighbour," and proceeded to do what is unusual with a New Year's resolution, keep it.

This may seem to be a digression from the subject of the secondary day-school, but it is not a digression in reality, since it calls attention to states of feeling which colour the mind of the teachers' profession. The fault does not lie with secondary day-schools any more than with other schools: it lies partly in history and partly in our natural instincts, for an Englishman's house is his castle, and an Englishman's school, if he is the Headmaster of it, is apt to be his thrice-walled and double-moated keep. These feelings

are certainly less acute and less sensitive than they were, but hard are the knocks in store for the optimist, even to-day, who proceeds on the innocent assumption that they do not exist.

The ideal of the day-school is in theory fine and natural, and a good day-school backed by a good home, and depending on it, offers a type of education which is perhaps superior to any. To this system the Scotch owe much of the greatness of their race, for their homes and their kirk provided religion, and their schools provided culture, and formed a character which was far from soft. The system demands that the home shall concern itself with, and value, education, and that the school shall value, and use, the home. It is excellent if both are good, but truth compels me to confess that the ideal is very imperfectly realized. It used to be the case that the average middle-class home was one in which religion, even though conventionally interpreted, was real. The creed might be narrow, even unintelligent, but it was there: it did rule life. And the Bible learned in childhood from a mother remained a power with those who had so learned it through the vicissitudes of life. But it can hardly be claimed that this is so to-day save in a certain number of instances, which compared with the whole are not many. It is quite probable that the home is one which is not really attached to any Christian church. Some may claim that it has discarded these standards because they are unsatisfactory, but it would be idle to pretend

that most homes have put any considered religious system, or any values at all, in their place. In religion the homes are drifting, and the attitude of parents is that they suppose these things are done at school. But they are not done at school, as I shall take occasion to point out later, and the result is that the day-school system is in danger of leaving religion out. If one believes that secondary education is most satisfactory, when almost entirely secular, well and good, I shall have no more to say: but if one believes, as I do, that all true education is religious, and that humanity must have religion, or perish, one cannot admit that the day-school system, based on the co-operation of home and school in the most natural and favourable conditions, yet somehow or other contriving to leave religion almost entirely out, is quite as admirable as it might be.

In other ways there is increasing collaboration between home and school. Thirty years ago there was little conscious intercourse: masters never knew the homes of the boys, nor visited their parents, nor even appeared to be interested in the matter: parents visited the schools for the sports, or a match at times, or the annual speech day, but otherwise kept their distance. And wisely. For the stories of great Victorian Headmasters of day-schools, and how they crushed the parent, are legion: "boys are always reasonable, masters sometimes, and parents never" seems to have summed up their philosophy, and inspired their behaviour. They sat in their dens, ready

to pounce on the slightest indiscretion or inadvertence. But I believe that all this has changed, and changed for the better. Masters are encouraged to see the boys' homes, and to make themselves friendly and trusted there: parents are more and more invited to parents' evenings at the school, where they can make the acquaintance of masters in natural and easy conditions, and learn something of what the school is trying to do. It is not easy to get all this done: it means a lot of trouble, and expenditure of time, for no very apparent immediate good. But it establishes human relations, and brings unity into the efforts of home and school. It is still a method not so frequently followed as it should be, there are still plenty of schools and plenty of homes which do not want to be bothered. For all that we are steadily advancing to a time when the local school in a district will be looked on quite naturally as a centre of culture and civilization for that district. This cannot easily be the case in great cities, where boys travel to a school from many points of a wide circumference, but in places of more manageable size, and in particular districts even of great cities, it is an ideal towards which some day-schools are already working, and which they will certainly accomplish. It is, however, in itself something not of necessity peculiar to day-schools: it is a function which can be equally fulfilled by the boarding-school, if it is not situated in an open and sparsely-inhabited countryside.

Let us, then, test the secondary day-school system by the five elements which I have taken as making up the tradition of English education, religion, discipline, culture, athletics, and service. Of religion I have already said something, though not all. I have said that it is being left out of most homes, but I have to endeavour to give the justification of my impression that it is also left out of the schools. I have not the least intention, or desire, to criticize the moral earnestness, or the religious conviction, of those who are in charge of the Secondary Schools: if it were not that some of them are men of exceptional devotion, things would be infinitely worse than they are. The question I ask is, what chance does the system give for a real presentation of religion, its call, and appeal, to a boy?

There are the daily prayers in the morning. Boys hurry in, masters hurry in, both with their minds in a rush, disturbed by the journey to the school, and full of the business of the day. There are formal prayers, a reading from the Bible, perhaps a hymn, and the school hastens off to its work. Five or ten minutes have been spent in surroundings which are not usually very uplifting, for the school assembly-hall is often of a utilitarian character, and the honour-boards and challenge-cups do not strike a note congenial to divine service. There may be a second assembly at the close of school, but this is nowadays rarely the case. There may be some special services, perhaps on one day of the year at a local church,

probably a service on Armistice Day, but that is all. It can hardly be said that it is easy to make much use of meagre opportunities such as these. There remains the period of religious instruction, and here I borrow a description which nothing in my own experience leads me to regard as unfair, save that I do not myself know of cases of agnostics and atheists teaching Scripture: it is written by the present Headmaster of a day-school situated in a great city. "It is a byword amongst those who have inside knowledge that this subject is the Cinderella of the curriculum. The weekly period of Bible teaching is relegated to any hole and corner of the time-table, which no one wants for the more important subjects of science and art. The teaching of it is delegated to any member of the staff who will give a grudging consent to undertake it, or who has nothing better to do. It is sometimes taught by agnostics and atheists who cynically confess in the Common Room that they would as lief teach Mohammedanism, if paid to do so. It is rarely taught by a specialist or by anyone who knows anything about the subject. And when it is so taught its true intention and purpose are often defeated by making of it a memory lesson to be crammed for a leaving examination." I need not comment on this description: it speaks for itself.

Boys, then, get what sense of religion and its meaning they can from the lives and examples of the masters who teach them, and this is not to be derided as negligible: it is often very

great. I am confident that many or most of the pupils of St. Olave's School, Southwark, derived a real sense of the meaning of a Christian faith by the life lived in their presence by their Headmaster, Rushbrooke. Many derive lessons which stand them in good stead, and sometimes change the current of their lives, from the example of men who sacrifice their leisure for their benefit, and now by scouting, now by school journeys, now by unpaid tuition, now by the running of some hobby-society or school club, show that they can give a real content to the command that men should love their neighbours. But it will be allowed that this is incomplete. A saint and an enthusiast can make the education of the day-school, as things are, a really religious education, but saints and enthusiasts are rare. No system has any right to expect that there will be forthcoming a sufficient supply of them to triumph in a large number of schools over the combined obstacles of lack of opportunity, apathy, and official indifference. As one that has passed from the world of the day-school to the world of the boarding-school, I can say that here at any rate I passed into a different and a better atmosphere.

There is nothing to find fault with in the discipline of the day-schools, which is in theory the same as in the boarding-schools. My only reason for using the words " in theory " is that the opportunities for making it real in practice are more restricted. I believe that Houses in day-schools

first began when the day-boys of Clifton College were divided into North Town and South Town, and treated as if they were boarding-houses of the school. This was applied before the end of the nineteenth century in Bristol Grammar School, which was purely a day-school, when the boys were divided according to the locality of the city from which they came. Day-schools are now divided quite commonly into arbitrarily selected "Houses," named usually after founders, or famous old boys. By this means masters are put into relations with boys, and boys with one another, that gives them responsibilities which they can carry out in a human and sympathetic way: but the mistake is often made of making the Houses too big. Duties are also assigned in form-rooms, and in the conduct of games: there are school monitors, or prefects, whose honours tend to be rather titular. It is unusual for boys to be given real responsibility in games, since this almost inevitably falls to a games master. The simple reason is that the boy has not time to do the work, since much of his leisure is spent in going to and from the school, and he has his preparation to do. The system is good and sound, but it is to the discipline of the boarding-schools as moonlight to sunlight, simply because the boarding-school is responsible for the whole time of the boy, both sleeping and waking, and the day-school for only a part.

On the side of culture the day-schools have nothing to fear from any comparison. They have

some initial advantage from the fact that nearly every boy at a day-school knows very well that he has got to depend on himself, on the use he makes of his brains, if he is to get on in the world. "*Res angusta domi*" is no bad spur, and it is not in Scotland only that it operates. The boys are ready to work hard, and few leave from the top forms without realizing that there is such a thing as knowledge, and that it does matter. I am speaking, as I think I should, of the best schools. The boys enjoy, moreover, a great advantage in that they are not segregated from the main stream of the nation's life; the problems of labour and of business, and the issues of politics, become real to them quite naturally, and have not to be learned about from books and lectures. But there are a great number of secondary day-schools, and I shall not make this claim of all of them. All schools are threatened to a lesser or greater degree by the danger of a mechanical conception of education, of which I shall speak more fully in another chapter; but in addition many of the schools are flooded with material of which it is doubtful whether a large part is intellectually fit for a secondary education at all as that has been hitherto conceived, and certain that, if they are, that education is not in content of the right sort to give them the best preparation for the life which they will have to lead. In other words, these schools would do a great deal better by their pupils if they were a great deal more free.

Of athletics it will not be necessary to speak otherwise than briefly. It is seldom that all the boys at a day-school could take part, if they wanted to do so, owing to the time which they must spend on journeys, and there are in any case very few day-schools which have anything like sufficient playing-space at their disposal: often what they have is situated at an inconvenient distance. How far this is a good thing, and how far bad, will depend upon the view which is taken of the value of athletics as an element of the educational tradition. Some will think that the day-schools are lucky to be saved by circumstances from the over-athleticism of the boarding-school: others will feel that the day-school boy loses a good deal of the joy of living, that he is in any case exposed to many influences which promote a wrong attitude to sport, to professionalism, to greyhound racing, to the insidious and never-ceasing effects of sporting journalism, and that it is a thousand pities that every boy has not a full chance of learning at the start of life to play games as they ought to be played. For he will not learn it in a Cup-Tie crowd, and it is just the secondary day-boys who most need the training who, as things are, get the least of it.

Is the spirit of service learned from such an education? The answer must be that it is, frequently enough, and that lives of a noble type are lived in the strength of it. It depends on the men who teach, and above all on the Head-

master who throws his personality into the school. It is clear that lower ideals may easily prevail, especially among boys who are none too well off. The motive with them may be purely selfish, the desire to get on, and not so much to make a mark in the world as to secure an adequate income: there may be too little willingness to treat life as an adventure, to go far from home, or to take any risk. The Civil Service, a Bank, or an Insurance Company may attract too many of those who with more courage might do far better. There will be others, in the day-schools as there are in the boarding-schools, to whom the main object of the days after school is to have a good time: their schools fail to make much of them, and they fail to make much of themselves. But every educational system has its failures, and the ideal of service to the community as an ideal for life can be, and frequently is, presented in the day-school with as much force as in the boarding-school, save always for the important fact that the day-school seldom is able to present it with the compelling force of religious motive.

The day-schools of the country embody a very fine tradition, and in some cases in the past it has been of the very highest. The future depends upon them. On the great day-schools of the old tradition a particular responsibility falls to-day, for they can most easily pass on the best elements of the ideal to the schools of newer foundation. They are the link which can not only most easily, but can alone, bind the boarding-school system

and the system of the State-aided municipal and county schools into a whole, which shall be animated by a single spirit. In the changes which the outward forms of religion are undergoing to-day, in the decline of positive religious influence in the average home, and the failure of the average Church and Chapel to grip the people, the schools remain as a great hope, just because they are a great net through which every member of the next generation must pass. Those schoolmasters, if there are such, who can rise to the measure of this opportunity, and build up in the schools a religion which boys can carry with them into life, will, if any of that profession can deserve the title, be worthy to be accounted great.

CHAPTER XII

ELEMENTARY EDUCATION—THE TRAINING OF A NATION

I HAVE given a double title to this chapter because it is not intended to be a close examination into the history and conditions of the elementary school so much as a consideration in broad outline of the function which the education of every child, beginning from the elementary school, may be expected to perform. The spirit in which that work was begun was grudging and distrustful, nor was the famous remark, which accompanied the bringing in of the Act for establishing universal elementary education, that " we must educate our masters," really indicative of the true spirit in which the work should be approached. We have to rise to a conception in which the nation will not appear to be divided into masters and servants, but a spiritually-unified community which is worthy of the loyalty and service of all its members, and, if we can rise to that, the natural statement of our duty will be that we must educate our children to make better use of life than we have been able to make ourselves. As things were, not of " malice prepense " on the part of any Machiavellian statesman, but

simply because educational provision could not outrun national readiness for it, "our masters" were offered a very inferior article, judged even by the standards of that day, which were not high, and to-day, in spite of the great sums that are lavished, they are, by the standards of the present, still offered a very inferior article. Yet, when I think of the conditions in which the work has been done, and the short space of time in which it has been accomplished, I am as surprised as I am thankful that it has been so successful: the nation owes more to its army of elementary teachers than to any other class of the community.

I suppose that it is honest to admit that among the "intelligentsia" and the well-to-do classes there is no subject upon which ignorance is so widespread as upon this whole topic of elementary education. Its failures are held up to derision, its successes ignored, and passed over in silence. "All this education," says the small business man, "I am sure I don't know what we pay for: the boys can't write, and spell, or do sums: much better put them to work, and have no nonsense about it." "It is surprising to me," says the magistrate, when he has before him a young criminal who has forgotten how to read and write, "that with the vast sums which the State lavishes on education, such a thing as this should be: it is doubtful whether the teachers can be attending to their proper business." "All this nonsense of girls' education in these Board schools," says the matron, "why don't they

teach them to cook and to sew, and then we might have a servant who was worth her keep." I need not multiply instances, but I should be surprised if any middle-class reader, who may happen to chance upon these words, has not heard many voices like these, and is not able to match them from his own experience. As a matter of fact, people do not know what is done, and what is not done in the elementary schools, nor make any allowance for the conditions in which the work is attempted.

Figures are apt to be dull, but a few in this connection may not be unilluminating. There are in England and Wales about 21,000 public elementary schools, and about 5½ million children upon their registers. There are over 162,000 teachers. These figures are impressive, and incidentally one may remark that for every individual boy at a great boarding-school there is something like one complete elementary school, so much larger is the field with which we are dealing. It looks as if the whole field of national education were well covered. But if we consider what happens at the age of 14, we find that roughly 670,000 children leave the schools, 82,000 of whom continue their education in some form or other of Higher Education, but nearly 600,000 pass out of the control of any form of school. This is just the age when the son of the well-to-do is entering upon the really important stage of his education, to which all that has gone before has led up, and the parent who sent his boy into the

world on leaving the Preparatory School would be universally regarded as a parent that has scandalously failed in his duty. The State has assumed the responsibilities of parenthood in the giving of education to the children of the people. Is there not some reason for thinking that it is not wholly fulfilling its duty if it totally neglects six in every seven of its charges after the age of fourteen ?

Incomplete as it is, elementary education has been a steadily civilizing agency. It has, I think, been the main influence which has prevented Bolshevism, Communism, and theories of revolt and destruction from obtaining any real hold upon the people of this country. Had the people been totally uneducated, anything might have happened after the strain of the War, when money had ceased to have meaning in relation to work, when the whole social system of Europe had proved itself a manifest failure by bringing about the War, and one great people had destroyed its leaders, and committed itself to it knew not what. It was just the fact that there had been enough social conscience, enough love of one's neighbour, in this country to have provided public education for a couple of generations, and to open the gates to political power to all, and that there were, therefore, enough who could read and think, that saved this country from a ruin to which it went near. I hope that those who attribute the scarcity of domestic servants to the unreasonable institution of elementary education, by which

they are made to pay for the teaching of other people's children, will lay in the other scale this other service, which has made of Bolshevism only a bogy which sits by their pillows and frightens them in the night, and not something which has wrecked their lives.

Let us in the same way as we have followed hitherto, test elementary education as it is, and not as it might be, by the same five elements which we are taking as the components of the English tradition. In the matter of religion this much can be claimed that every child in the country, unless exempted under a conscience clause, receives for seven years of life, usually every day, and certainly for two hours in every week, a lesson on the English Bible. There are no services and no sermons, though of course in the voluntary schools, which still deal with a very large percentage of the nation's children, there is in addition a certain amount of simple doctrinal teaching. I am not going to embark on the vexed question how far religious teaching, to be effective, must be denominational. I have heard it stated that if in a small town there were but two elementary schools, of which one was denominational, and one was not, you would know by the subsequent behaviour, conduct, and careers of the citizens which had studied the Bible in a denominational atmosphere and which had not done so. I can only say that this sort of attitude seems to me to have no justification in theory, or support from experience. I believe that the nation has been largely driven

away from the support of institutional religion by the unmeaning jealousies of the Churches and by the want of mutual charity which has too often been the outstanding mark of those who have professed a religion of which charity is the cardinal virtue. I am aware of agreed schemes of religious instruction in more than one part of the country which seem to me to embody all that Christian men and women can demand, or require, for children of a tender age, and I know that these are being followed daily with success in many Council Schools. But whatever imperfections there may be on the religious side in elementary education, imperfections in great measure due to the civil warfare of Christian sects, I feel assured of this, that religious instruction is healthier and more adequate than it is in that part of the secondary-school system which is under the ægis of the State. I am also well aware that there are plenty of people who will say that this is very cold comfort: and yet I would bid them be of good courage, for thanks to what has been done in the past, elementary education is not likely to become secular, nor the Bible to be forgotten.

Discipline in connection with the elementary school conjures up the picture of a harried master confronted by a class of impossible numbers, maintaining order by methods almost military. This is another of the pictures which need to be dismissed from the popular imagination, for it has no relation to the facts. The discipline of

elementary schools has steadily improved, and stern repression has steadily given way to co-operation: the relations of teachers and taught are now largely the relations of those who are engaged upon a common task, and are interested in it, so that the stick is much less in evidence. But the effect of discipline is wider than this. There are people who will have seen a disorderly and poverty-stricken neighbourhood slowly recover self-respect, and form different habits of life, merely because there has been a good elementary school in the neighbourhood. The result does not of course come all at once, but it comes in a generation. At the start the teachers have had to fight the influence of the parents outside the schools, and at the same time fight and quell the indiscipline of the boys inside the school. But the generation so mastered and civilized, which has in other words learned discipline, goes out to be the parents of the next, and in the case of their children the parents are on the side of the school. The results are manifest to those who look, and should be manifest to all; but people easily forget, and in finding fault with the defects of the present forget the much greater faults of the past. The photographs which the London Education Authority publishes in some of its handbooks and reports, showing a class in an elementary school in the 'nineties, and the same class twenty years later, are quite sufficient in themselves to dispel doubts, if any entertain them, that the elementary schools are imparting

a definite discipline. The observer who is looking for other evidence will find it in the behaviour of an English crowd, which is eminently manageable because it consists of individuals who know how to manage themselves. They never get out of hand, and will always do what they are wanted to do if they only know what it is. The policeman is looked on as the friend of everybody in a great city like London, because he represents a system of order which the elementary school teacher has taught the nation to respect. The army which fought in the War was ready for action in an unexpectedly brief period, although everything had to be extemporized; it fought with intelligence, and behaved with reasonableness, because every member had had the training of the elementary school. And if purists and sensitive people are still offended by the bad manners of the young, they ought to realize how much better these are than they used to be, and ascribe the improvement again to those who can rightly claim credit for it, the elementary school teachers.

Intellectuals may be inclined to look down their noses at the culture of the elementary school as being that which provides certain daily and Sunday newspapers with their immense circulations. It is no fault of that culture if it cannot go very far: the question is whether, up to the point where it stops short, it has been travelling on right lines. It is undoubtedly true that those who have not themselves passed through an elementary school have the haziest notions as to

what is actually taught in them, though that does not prevent them from repeating assertions about the curriculum which are as unhesitating as they are unfounded. It is worth while, therefore, to put down briefly what the content of the average curriculum is, for it has been arrived at by some decades of experiment and represents the common mind of a large number of practitioners. It is not the creation of a code, and it is not fast bound in misery and iron, as some think: reasonable freedom of variation is encouraged in individual schools, or at any rate certainly allowed. There are about 26 hours in the week, and of these some $2\frac{1}{2}$ will be given to religious instruction and the hymns and prayers of the school, and ten will be given to the three "R's" of familiar fame. Five will be devoted to history and geography, drawing, and class singing, and about five to practical work, which in the case of the boys includes woodwork, and often simple metal-work. The remainder will be used up by physical drill and by the routine business of the school. Nor does the teaching stop fast inside the school buildings and the hours of the school time-table. It is becoming increasingly common, and can be called characteristic, for groups of older pupils to go on conducted visits to places of interest of very varied character, and frequently, too, school journeys are planned and carried out. The programme of work is surely sensible, and the critic may justly be asked in what direction he would seek to change or to improve it, it being always

remembered that it is possible for any individual teacher to introduce a variation to which he can give a real value.

This programme is no longer carried out under the shadow of an annual examination to which every child had to be subjected, and to which all methods of teaching were bound to have reference, since payment was strictly by results. That system carried with it a restriction of the syllabus to a certain definite content, and that is the reason why people more than thirty years later retain the impression that elementary schools cannot call their souls their own. When they were young they heard the bitter complaints that were made. In its place has come the system by which each head-teacher arranges his own syllabus and programme. In all his work he is assisted by the visits of inspectors, who both in elementary and secondary education have played a beneficent part, and received for it scant acknowledgment and little gratitude. Classification of pupils according to ability and achievement has now become not only possible but invariable. The cloud on the horizon which threatens to overcast this fair day, and perhaps it is already more than a cloud, is that it is necessary to sort out at the end of the course more and more universally the boys who are to go on to a course of regular secondary education, the boys who are fit for a Central School, and so on. In this way the curriculum may again become too much dominated by an examination, and therefore fixed, and

the teaching too much dominated by the necessity of imparting that special ability of answering questions on paper, which I believe to involve at this stage wrong methods of teaching. But there is no cause why reasonable methods of selection should not be elaborated and used which will save the culture of the elementary school from falling into Charybdis when it has with such happy results escaped from Scylla.

In athletics there is still much to seek. One cannot but look with sadness at those small unattractive concreted yards which are all that many urban schools possess, and the still meaner enclosures of rural schools, where land was at any rate to be had at no great price. Still in these difficulties something is done. There is usually in force a well-thought-out system of physical drill, and in a good many schools the playing of games comes into the curriculum, while everything possible is done to encourage swimming. But even when all credit is given for these activities, character-training by means of games cannot be said to form part of the elementary school tradition, merely because of the almost total lack of opportunity. Nor can service be regarded as any conscious element in the ideal, for the children are of necessity too young to understand what it means. The ideal as presented to them must be more direct, immediate, and concrete. But service is, and has been, the ideal of the teachers, and many of them have lived lives of little financial reward, humble status,

and narrow worldly prospects, under the inspiration of that ideal and no other. I have known some elementary teachers who have been the salt of the earth, whose savour the modern world cannot spare.

The work that has been done is a splendid foundation on which to build, and now it is advisable to look in the face those hard facts which have prevented it from being better than it is. The first, and most obvious, is that the classes have always been too large, and though they are smaller than they were, they remain too large. Elementary education is a vastly expensive process, and therefore it has always tended to be done on the cheap. Hence those classes of seventy and eighty which a single teacher was supposed to handle, and in a way did handle. We must not forget, before we condemn our forefathers for being unreasonable, or completely indifferent, that at the beginning of the nineteenth century the great Dr. Keate at Eton was himself regularly trying to teach 120 boys at once, all the fifth-formers and sixth-formers together. For our grandfathers, remembering their own school days, regarded a class as being merely the number of boys whom one individual could hope to cow into minding their book: the teacher's part was to hear the lesson, and use the stick. But however this may have come about, the question concerns to-day. The standard to which we are working, though it is by no means realized yet, even in the schools of the most

progressive authorities, is forty-eight members of a class in an infants' school, and forty in the schools for boys and girls. As to this, it is to be observed that in secondary schools it is universally felt that a class of thirty is too large and a class of twenty-four large enough, and that ideally, the lower down the school you go, the smaller should the classes be. One of the greatest merits of the English preparatory schools is that their classes are quite small. Now what is sauce for the secondary school must also be sauce for the elementary school. It is not unreasonable to suppose that twenty-four, and not forty-eight, is probably the proper number for an infants' class, and perhaps twenty-four is a number ideally too large. Thirty, and not forty, should be the maximum for the higher classes. In such circumstances the teacher could know each individual boy, and know him well: he could hope to exercise individual influence on him, both at school and afterwards. He could, moreover, teach much more effectively, and draw things out of boys rather than hammer them into them. So far he has been an expositor, lecturer, technician in class-management, for he has been compelled to be: by no other methods could the attention of sixty boys at once be held, and their industry directed, but the inevitable result has been that much of the work done by the boys has been superficial.

Another cause of failure has been that the age of fourteen, when the whole process terminates,

is too advanced an age for the able boy to be still confined to the subjects of the elementary curriculum: in the past such boys have been wasting their time so far as intellectual advance is concerned during their last two years at school. We have come to a clearer conception of elementary education as a stage which in the average individual should stop at eleven or twelve, and of secondary education as a process which then begins, and may go on until eighteen or nineteen. This may be regarded now as common ground among educationists, but it involves a very drastic remodelling of our educational system.

A third cause of failure is that very little can be done to train boys through games, but of this I have already spoken. The fourth and greatest cause of failure is that by far the largest part of the product, six in every seven, are thrown to the mercy of chance at the very moment, the age of fourteen, when their previous education is about to pay compound interest, if continued, and when at the same time most of what they have learned can be forgotten, in many cases entirely. The nation is like a gardener who is raising early bulbs under glass: he plants them in large numbers, and provides the heat which brings them to the point when they have broken through the earth, and established growth: at this point he says, this heat is very expensive, and he draws his furnaces, and opens the doors and windows to any breeze that likes to blow: he would not receive much sympathy if he then went

about lamenting the paucity and imperfection of his blossoms. Yet this is what the State system of education does with the nation's children. Poor Law commissioners, social workers, clergy, and educationists have been pointing this out incessantly for these twenty years past, and more, and they must continue to say over again what has been continually said before. The continuation school which is to-day in effect offered to the average boy is the continuation school of the blind alley, of casual employment, or of corner-loafing. When a magistrate severely comments on the inefficiency of elementary education if a young offender proves to have forgotten what he has learned, one is strongly tempted to ask the wise judge what he himself would have retained, if he had been taken from his preparatory school to spend the next four years in dropping solder on to tins in endless succession for eight hours every day, or in laying sheets of paper on to a machine or taking them off again. There are the evening classes, it may be said, but can the average child make much use of an evening class after an eight-hour day in a factory, or a long day of knocking about the streets at the tail of a van ?

There is a long road to be followed before the nation gets for all its children the sort of education which they deserve, and would repay. The great cost of such a provision may naturally alarm even the generous, and it can in any case only come about gradually. It is a sad thing to think that Europe blew into the air in four years the accumu-

lated savings which, wisely spent, might have created a generation of very different possibilities, with the promise of achievement before them instead of disillusionment, and a strong hope instead of despondency or indifference. Half the cost of the War would have created a new England, but the fates willed otherwise, and now the struggle must be harder and more prolonged. The next step seems to be clear enough. It is to re-classify the children, giving them all an education in two stages, of which the first, being purely elementary, shall end about eleven, and the next at fifteen. This will mean the raising of the school-leaving age by one year, and for this the country is probably ready. Yet I doubt whether it would be wise to proclaim it as free secondary education for all, since the curriculum of secondary education is a well-understood thing, and only a travesty of it could be imparted to all children in a course which must stop with the fifteenth year. Secondary education has been dominated, and rightly so, by the standards of entrance to the Universities, and to the professions : it is efficient for its purpose, very valuable in its place, but it ought not by any means to be accepted as right for all the boys of the country, who in the vast majority of cases will not enter either Universities or professions. The lines which this post-primary education should follow need thinking out from the basis of the education which precedes, and it should definitely set before it as its aim the production of sound character more than intellectual

performance. It used to be assumed that everybody was capable of profiting by a full secondary education in the full academic sense: all that would be necessary, it was thought, would be to pour children into the schools, and the rest would follow. Yet only a small proportion of the possible entrants have been promoted to the secondary schools, and already there are signs that the course of study is not well-suited to them, nor really within their intellectual power. Already, too, there is outcry about the overcrowding of the black-coated occupations and the unwillingness to enter the life of handicraft and production. To build the post-primary course on similar lines will be to convert this country into a nation of clerks very largely unemployed. Moreover, there is the question of educability, not as yet sufficiently explored. Educability is not a matter of class: intellectual talent of every sort is produced in a certain quantity by every class of the community. But it is only in a certain quantity, and many schoolmasters are aware that among the sons of the rich and the well-to-do there are always a certain number who, in spite of every adventitious aid that money can purchase to help them, are incapable of profiting by the higher types of academic education. Yet it is well worth while for these boys to remain at school, for they are acquiring an education from the life lived, and the standards by which it is lived, which will stand them in good stead all their days. It would be better for such boys that they should not be

attempting the ordinary school course at all. From these considerations it would seem to follow that the course to be followed by all from eleven to fifteen should be one designed to produce a good physique, practical ability to be developed by more extended teaching of handicraft, a knowledge of scientific method, a good standard of English in speech and writing, and those practical virtues of integrity and the sense of responsibility which a good education can certainly develop. It is assumed that from this course all those of intellectual ability at all above the average will have been drafted to other types of school, which will follow the old well-ascertained lines. For the nation of the future will want the service of all the first-class brains it can get, brains that have been used for the acquisition of knowledge: but what it does not want, and cannot employ to advantage, is a plethora of second-class brains which have been attempting a programme which it takes first-class ability to fulfil.

I believe that this education should make it a special aim to promote the good speaking of the English language, which would carry with it some knowledge of what is written in that tongue, and some respect for a noble instrument of human conversation. I have already said that Englishmen are sharply divided from one another by differences of pronunciation. It is not a question of differences of dialect, and no one objects to these tones which indicate that the speaker comes from north of the Tweed, or from across St. George's

Channel. It is a question of "twang," of polluted vowel sounds, of the reduction of all manner of different values to the one sound of "-er". It is one of the chief causes of class division in this country, and it is removable. Already, thanks to elementary education, the people who could employ the aspirate in every place except the right one, have become, even since living memory, very rare in the land: they are not to be found among the younger people. The greater task of teaching the people to pronounce their own language as it ought to be spoken can also be accomplished in the schools. Broadcasting will help, but broadcasting alone cannot do it. The teachers can.

This education should also make it a special aim to promote the playing of games: the National Playing-field movement is deserving not only of all private but of all public support. It is not merely a matter of health: it is an urgent need, because there are lessons which need to be learned by all that can easily be learned by the playing of games in the right spirit, and cannot easily be learned by any other method. By all means do everything that is possible by medical treatment, by dental clinics, and by physical training on the Swedish or any other system, to bring it about that the population shall have healthy bodies, and no longer contribute so many to the C 3 category. But we need in the population of the future not only healthy bodies, but hardness, resource, indomitability, generosity, obedience to rule and the sense of honour. These qualities cannot be

generally learned by all boys unless they can learn them by games, and games they cannot play unless there are playing-fields in which they can take place. A school without such open spaces has become an anachronism.

I dream of a time not so far distant when this education will extend to the age, not of fifteen, but of sixteen, and of a time not so near, but still to be hoped for, when all boys from sixteen to eighteen will be formed into groups for continued education, and the instincts which lead them to form gangs, and to seek dubious adventures, can be sublimated by right occupation and by responsibility into virtues of national value. Through the whole system should go the spirit of a call to service, the facing of life as a gallant adventure. Then for the first time would England deserve to be called Merrie England, when all were made fit to live life worthily, to enjoy liberty and to use it rightly, and to pursue their individual happiness through public well-being.

CHAPTER XIII

THE DANGER FROM MECHANIZATION

WHAT has been written so far, has been intended to be a description, though doubtless far from complete, of things as they are, seen in the light of the ideal which the nation has accepted in theory, however imperfectly it may have been realized in practice. It remains to consider what dangers threaten to interfere with the following of this ideal in the future, for we are in the midst, or rather in the early stages, of a vaster educational experiment than the world has yet seen. No one has yet witnessed an educated nation in being, nor is aware of what an educated democracy could accomplish. It would be a sad misfortune if development were thwarted and growth turned awry, by the interference of unenlightened influences and unnecessary machinery, or the dominance of other ideals, attractive though unworthy. I have called the danger which is to be the subject of this chapter, mechanization, and by that I mean the cramping and deadening influences which may proceed from the too rigid working of the necessary machinery which is external to the life of the schools, and merely intended to provide the conditions that are most favourable to growth.

The Board of Education might have been expected to be the worst of the offending influences, and in its early days, when it had still mainly to deal with elementary education, there were many who thought that it would strangle all real life out of education. "Of course," writes Thring to a friend in 1885, "I see clearly enough that the present exponents of education in London won't do. As far as I know them, they are the strangest mixture of red-tape, crude dissatisfaction, narrow sciolism, revolutionary fumes, unworkable old and unworkable new, kneaded up into an infallible pudding, that can be imagined." The views of Thring were shared by his contemporaries, and if there is any legacy which was left by our predecessors to those who are in charge and control of the leading schools at the present time, it was couched in the strict and often reiterated command to have nothing to do with the Board of Education, or any of its works. And there are still some who cry out against it, most unjustly. In its treatment of elementary education it has abolished the system of payment by results, of compulsory examination on a compulsory syllabus: it has introduced an era of self-government and of initiative. In its treatment of secondary education it has also passed from a period when it defined in greater or less detail the true content of the curriculum, and required that this and nothing else should be taught, a period which it must be allowed was necessary, to the present stage of greater freedom when it looks to the schools again

to show the qualities of self-direction and initiative. It operates not through codes and regulations, but through inspectors, and the Inspectorate is a body which is not so much concerned to see that all the requirements of red-tape are fully complied with, as one whose business is the cross-fertilization of schools, the suggestion of methods which have been employed with happy results in similar circumstances in other places, and the offering of skilled and experienced advice to schools or localities which find themselves in a difficulty. It is not uncommon for teachers to-day to observe that the art of teaching has progressed out of all knowledge in the last twenty-five years. That may, or may not, be so, for what is usually meant is that subjects are taught now which were not taught before. But I think that there has been a general rise in the average level of teaching in the secondary schools, due perhaps to many causes, but chief among them I place the beneficent activity of the Inspectorate of the Board of Education. And this has come to be, because they have never interfered with the real freedom of the schools, nor sought to hamper the genuine teacher.

But when the business of education was handed over at the beginning of this century to local authorities of very various dimensions and outlook, Whitehall was not able to transfer to all of them its own spirit of enlightened confidence, and there are to-day certainly difficulties and dangers which as a consequence threaten the life of the schools, though there is no reason for despondency,

or for believing that these dark clouds are more than temporary. They are not due to the fact that the members of education authorities are chosen, not for their knowledge or experience of education, but usually for a variety of other reasons, none of which have anything to do with their special work; or, if they are so due, they are only partly due to that cause. The detailed work of educational administration is heavy and intricate, and the Education Committees have been compelled to appoint permanent officials with permanent offices under their control. This official remains, but the Chairman of the Education Committee and its members do not: they are answerable to an inconstant electorate and they cannot usually give their whole time in any case to the work. The reality of power, therefore, must inevitably reside with the permanent adviser, if he plays his cards with any skill, for he has every string beneath his fingers, and can, if he likes, make and unmake the futures of teachers. If he is himself a man of education and enlightenment, all is likely to be well: he respects freedom, and he encourages initiative. If he has come to the work of controlling secondary education from an experience of elementary education gathered when it was still mechanical, and each school was merely the manifestation on similar lines of the working out of a central code, or if he has behind him merely the conceptions of managing a factory, or running a business, he may conclude, if he is also unimaginative, that education is something which

can be directed from the end of a telephone, and that by means of returns, reports, and costings, by which the branches of all efficient industries are regulated and corrected, it can in its turn be made efficient also. The passion of such officials is for uniformity, so that regulations from the central office may easily apply, and the power of giving directions, growing by what it feeds on, imposes rules as to length of holidays, hours of session, choice of school books, selection of stationery, attendance of masters, nature of school functions, which in the mass leave the school with the sense that it has no freedom and no real life of its own. Separate boards of governors are inconvenient, for they waste the time of the permanent official: they are connected with, and are a guarantee of, the individuality of the school, but the administrator does not want individuals, but specimens of a common uniform type, warranted to be according to specification. Separate boards of governors, therefore, tend to disappear, and the Education Committee finds itself the governing body of many schools, perhaps, both for boys and girls, and its Education officer the clerk to all of them. The climax is reached when the Heads of the different schools are forbidden to approach the Chairman of the Higher Education Committee save through the permanent official, and it is not surprising that I have heard one such official in giving evidence before a public committee speak of "my city," "my Education Committee" and "the policy which I carry out

in my schools." This state of affairs is by no means universal, but there are regions both in the North of England and in Wales where the shoe pinches, and sometimes pinches very hard, where the Heads of schools are despondent and discontented, since they feel that they are neither free to manage their own schools nor to speak their minds in public. It is to be admitted that the management of a considerable number of schools by a Local Education Authority is a difficult task, and that mistakes of treatment are bound to occur in the early stages : there must be reasonable give-and-take on both sides. But there is no reason in the nature of things why the Director of Education, by whatever title he may happen to be called, should not be content to take as his province finance and the serving of tables, the maintenance and upkeep of buildings, and the reasonable spending of money voted, and why every secondary school should not have an individual Board of Governors, to which the Headmaster should be responsible, which should be specially interested in the well-being and true functioning of that particular school. The Education Committee cannot be such a body, for not only do its members change, but it is a familiar truth that what concerns everybody concerns nobody in particular. There is no reason in the nature of things why the Headmaster should not be given a free hand in shaping the policy of a school and in planning and inspiring the curriculum, why he should not be responsible for the choice, and, subject to appeal, the dismissal

of his assistants, why, in a word, he should not feel the burden and the delight of freedom and initiative. The best hope is that those officials, who have, in some cases, gone far on a wrong path through an excess of zeal and a mistaken sense of the true nature of education, may be succeeded by men who realize that there are limits to their activity which they cannot overstep without injury to the work which all concerned should be trying to carry out in common.

For teaching is an art, and it is the essence of all genuine artistic activity that it must be free in its functioning. You can ask an artist to paint your picture, or you can direct a photographer to produce a number of portraits: in the one case you will get from the true artist an interpretation of your personality, from the other you will get certain faithful, but mechanical, reproductions. In the one case the artist is contributing the whole of himself to the work, in the other the professional is superintending the working of a mechanical process. Do we want our teachers to be no more than the latter type, merely competent workmen and no more? Or shall we try for something higher, even if it involve the making of mistakes? Education is qualitative, not quantitative: it cannot be fairly tested by any possible tabulation of comparative results, so dear to the common-sense mind of business. This school, it is said, passed fifty children through the School Certificate, and that passed only twenty-five: it must be twice as good as the other. Nothing could be more

unfair : it might well be that the latter school was really giving the better education, for the material is not, and can never be, uniform. And the things that really matter most—you cannot test any of them. You cannot take any of the five elements which go to compose the ideal of what I call our English tradition, religion, or discipline, or culture, or the true spirit of athletics, or the spirit of service, and devise any test by which you can fairly say that School A has an efficiency mark of seventy-five per cent. and School B no more than sixty. But by imposing a quantitative system of estimating these school-results which can be measured, and ranking schools accordingly, you can take the heart out of your very best men, and very quickly starve the profession by diverting from entry those men of resource, high principle, and initiative which it most requires.

These difficulties should right themselves in time, for our nation has an instinctive love of freedom, a sense of its value, and a practical gift for working out the best administrative methods. But the system of external examination which overshadows our higher education from beginning to end is something much more subtle, and, unless controlled, can be far more dangerous. It is said to be in accordance with our national instinct, though it would be safer and fairer to say that it is in accordance with the national instinct of the nineteenth-century Englishman, and that for us makes it inevitable enough. So the old Greek apophthegm *ἀνεξέταστος βίος οὐ βιωτός* is profoundly

true of the average English don and schoolmaster, if it may be translated "a life without examinations is a life not to be lived." I have myself been held up to the nation by no less a power than *The Times* as a rash person who has been disrespectful about the Ark of the educational covenant, although as a matter of fact I had been defending the system of external examinations in their proper and, as I think, inevitable function. My defence was not read, or at any rate not reported: my attack on its abuses was given publicity all over the world. Perhaps that was no bad thing, and in any case the truth about examinations can be very simply put. As I am myself under suspicion, I will not put it in my own words, I will quote what Bishop Creighton once said at a Prize Distribution at Peterborough on the 21st November, 1894: "In one sense examinations are good, in another bad. Without examinations there would be a tendency to idleness and laxity, teachers would not be kept up to the mark. The evil side of examinations is that, while they are simply meant to be tests, teachers will insist upon regarding them as standards. To get a class through an examination is too often regarded as the sole aim and object of teaching, but the real object should be so to train and educate the children as to develop their intellect generally. Worse still, when the teachers take the examination as a standard, they will also insist upon trying to take short cuts towards the desired end. They cause certain facts and certain

answers to be committed to memory, and in this way, instead of developing the intelligence of the children, they strive to circumvent the inspector (examiner), treating him as if he were a foe instead of a friend. As the examination draws near, they allot to themselves the time necessary to cram into the heads of their scholars the knowledge required in order to pass. . . . True education consists in developing the intellect, not in committing to memory before an examination pages of information often profoundly dry and generally inaccurate." I would only add to this for my own part that examinations are the only way as yet known to man for finding out whether a person has, or has not, certain definite knowledge which he is supposed or required to have. When a large number of people desire to show their fitness for further study, or to compete with one another for a prize awarded for knowledge, the only fair way is to put them all down in a room, give them the same set of questions, and an equal allowance of time, and see what they will make of it. No conceivable method of estimating merit or knowledge by means of interviews, school records, or intelligence tests can possibly replace this process. It is there : we have to make the best of it, as our servant, and not our master. We have to remember continually that all that it tells us is that a student can write answers of sufficient intelligence and knowledge on a subject which he is understood to have studied. But it does not tell us, and never can, whether the student has had

a good education in the sense in which I use the word.

Let me reinforce this statement by again quoting from Edward Thring, one of the greatest, if not the greatest, teachers in England which the nineteenth century produced, whose spirit I believe we need to recapture. I will put down three short paragraphs :

" If education and training are the true aim of mankind, and power in a man's self the prize of life, then no superstition ever ate into a healthy national organism more fatal than the cult of the examiner." " A system of examination and inspection, in proportion to its power, is death to all original teaching, to all progress arising from new methods, and even to all improvement which is at all out of the routine track." " Where examinations reign, every novelty in training, every original advance, every new method of dealing with mind, becomes at once simply impossible. It is outside the prescribed area, and does not pay."

These are strong words, perhaps stronger than they need be, but they express the profound and burning conviction of a great artist in teaching. And now for a moment let us dispassionately consider the probable course to which many an able boy will be subjected, as he passes through the system of English higher education. He will before he is fourteen either sit for a scholarship at a public school, and reach for his years a high and unnatural standard of specialization, or he

will sit for the entrance examination. In another two years he will sit for the School Certificate, and then in another two years for a Higher Certificate. He will then sit for an open scholarship at the University. He will then spend his time preparing and sitting for a variety of examinations up to his Tripos or Final Schools, and may very well end by competing in a final gladiatorial contest extending over many days for a place in the Home or Indian Civil Service. I do not say that any of this is avoidable, but I do say that, if the patient has a mind of his own at the end of the process, he is lucky. I was myself submitted to the full rigour of this Spartan course, and before I was twenty-four had spent the equivalent of four months of my existence in turning out two three-hour papers a day. I acquired the necessary knack, but I can report in my own case that I did not really begin to think for myself until the process was over. Up to the completion of the triumph in my own case of the examination system I spent my time in the assiduous collection of facts, and views about those facts which were likely to find favour with examiners. And then I started gaily out to submit other people to the same process, but I rapidly found that what I was doing required me to think things out for myself to a greater extent than I had hitherto had the time to do. Examinations test information, but they do not test for life, and only partially do they fit for life: hence the truth of what is a matter of common observation, that the prize-bedecked

champion of the examination-rooms is often in the long run no conspicuous success in life.

The pointing out of these truths (for they are truths, and cannot be denied) make certain teachers very angry, for they feel that examinations are a necessary thing, and in that way a good thing, and it is their business to get their pupils through them. And so it is. And of the best of us in connection with examinations, how many must have occasion to say, "*Video meliora proboque, deteriora sequor*"? For what does the system, if it is taken to be the be-all and end-all of a school's existence, entail for the unfortunate teacher? I quoted in a previous chapter an eloquent passage [1] of Edward Bowen in enthusiastic praise of the work of the true teacher: I will attempt to rewrite it in the spirit of the naked examination-system. "This is indeed something worth being enthusiastic for. To convince boys that the examination has got to be passed, and the intellectual labour has to be faced, that they are travelling on an arbitrary errand, gaining higher certificates every step of the way, and may as well make up their minds to tackle the drudgery of it, and try to feel that they are enjoying a race or a climb: to help them to be good examinees by every form of 'memoria technica,' use of back papers, 'spotting' of questions and likely bits, lists of facts, and tabloids of information that we know of ourselves, and so lead them to trust in cramming, to hope for it, to cherish it, this, succeed as it may here and fail

[1] Page 91.

there, quickened as it may be by health and sympathy, or deadened by fatigue and disappointment, is a work which has in it most of the elements which make up the life of the School Certificate form-master. It is to be done by putting books before boys, and hearing them so much at a time: and by offering prizes and punishments: and by assuring them that every English schoolboy, who is not a 'dud,' can pass the School Certificate. . . . A man, or an older pupil, can cram himself from books: a young boy needs it from the words and gestures of a teacher." But I will not parody further. I will add again his own words: "The work of teaching will be respected when the things that are taught begin to deserve respect."

Lest I be taken too seriously, I hasten to add that I do not think that there are many teachers who follow such relentless methods of "cram," just as there are few teachers who have the freshness, continuous vigour, and genius of Bowen. We are most of us somewhere in the wide country in between, and most of us a little too conscious of the urgent pressure which examinations are exercising on ourselves, our methods, and our pupils. I have merely painted the relentless crammer in the same spirit as the Spartan elders exposed the drunken helot to the inspection of the youth of their country.

To avoid vagueness, I will try to put down in series the evils which are in my opinion following from the wrong or uncontrolled use of examinations in England to-day. I will take them, first, on

the side of competition, where they are being used, on a principle which in theory is quite reasonable and defensible, for the selection of one or a few from a number, but where in practice unintended results are following, which are prejudicial to education. I take first the scholarships awarded by open competition at the ancient Universities, which have a very far-reaching effect upon all the higher work of the best schools. In science the standard has been, and continues to be, steadily forced up until now it is no longer possible for a candidate to hope for success, and still continue at school any general education that is a reality. The object of the test is admittedly to pick the best boy, and the specialist examiners of the various colleges are out to pick the best physicist, or chemist, or whatever it may be: they have their eye on the rival colleges, they think only in terms of their own subject, they are not concerned with what the result may be in the schools, and the result is, as I am informed, that questions are asked of boys of eighteen which twenty-five years ago were considered suitable for the second part of the Tripos, and then only under easier conditions of time. The schools have to follow, and attempt to comply with the lead which is forced upon them, and the result is the specialized, but almost wholly uneducated, scientist. Though I have somewhat studiously refrained from bringing into discussion the problems that have special reference to girls, I cannot forbear from quoting what was said by Dr. Brock at a conference at

University College (January, 1929) of the effect of a similar misuse of examinations on women. "Competition for places in resident Colleges," she says, "is now so keen that most girls have to try the scholarship papers, the standard of which is steadily forced up: and the combination of expert cramming and natural precocity which is sometimes successful, is not always the best foundation for ripened scholarship and real culture. Staleness at College is a too frequent result of this early specialization, and overstrain is another. I imagine that some here will be eternally grateful, as I am, for the fact that they went up to the University ignorant and fresh: but we know that the doors of our Colleges would be shut upon us to-day. In all conferences with College staffs premature specialization is unanimously deplored: but the syllabuses and still more the papers still tend in many subjects to put a premium upon it. The schools do realize the enormous difficulty of the Colleges in this matter of selection: but we still maintain that that elusive thing "promise," which the Colleges are out to find, is tested better by reasonable syllabuses and papers than by setting, for example, a Latin prose of a Final honours type, or an Unseen paper so hard and so long that it becomes a test not of scholarship, but of endurance and speed and practice, or of a quick-witted and superficial facility."

Nor are the Colleges the only offenders, for the schools themselves are tarred with the brush of the same offence, at any rate some of the boys'

schools, for I hasten to return to the field of male education, in which I feel on safer ground. Exactly what the schools say of the older Universities, many of the preparatory schoolmasters say of the Public Schools, which in their scholarship examinations force young boys to attempt to attain unnatural standards. In this case it has always been so, and things are not so bad as they were. It would be a very valuable inquiry for psychologists to undertake, to discover what is the effect of early forcing upon the immature brain. I do not know enough about this to dogmatize: I admit that it appears hard to damage a really strong, healthy, clever boy: but not all are of this type. And I have seen too many promising scholars, who have remained industrious, passed in the race by boys who at fourteen were not in the same class with them, to be anything but profoundly uneasy about the effect on brain-development of forcing a crop from the soil before its time.

That which is being done in the case of the clever and exceptional for the award of scholarship is being done in the case of large and increasing numbers of quite average boys by the growing dominance of the School Certificate. The numbers who sit for it grow by leaps and bounds: 20,000 a year ten years ago, there are now 70,000 or more candidates annually. It is the mark of the secondary school that its boys sit for one or other of the certificates awarded by the eight examining authorities. This does not unfortunately mean

that the boys of the nation are displaying the quality of unlimited educability, much as that might be to be desired : it means that an increasing number are being forced up to an examination for which they are not intellectually fit, and which prevents them from receiving the education which the schools would wish to give them, and which would prove of far more benefit as a preparation for life. That is the basic fact which is at the root of the incessant unrest which is manifest in nearly all assemblies of teachers of secondary schools at the present time : it is that the examination is being used to impose the curriculum, and that the work of the schools and the true interest of the pupils do not shape the examination. In addition, the examination system is being used in some localities as a ready means for drawing comparisons between school and school, so that in self-defence the teachers have to drive and hound the children through unnecessary work which they will as soon as possible forget. For examination results are so tangible : they are things which the world's coarse finger and thumb are so easily able to plumb, and the conclusions which it draws are to the man in the street so obvious, and to the instructed so exceedingly fallacious.

We are probably on the eve of a further great extension of the ambit of secondary or at any rate post-primary education, and it is surely a timely moment to insist that all that an examination tests is a certain intellectual quality, to the exclusion

of everything else, and that the imposition of an examination for all, when parents, teachers, education committees, and their directors are what they are, inevitably tends to make performance in the examination the main test, and therefore the main object of the school. Yet surely this quality to the exclusion of all others is not what we are seeking to cultivate in the great average mass of the nation's youth. To my way of thinking the chief blot on that admirable document, the Report on the Education of the Adolescent, is that it lays down that it is desirable to make available a special examination of a type suitable for pupils leaving post-primary schools, and this, before the schools have even come into existence. For what reasons ? Because, if they did not have certificates of their own, they would try for others, because examinations give a standard, because children enjoy them, because boys and girls are handicapped unless they can produce tangible evidence of their attainments. The usual safeguarding clause is solemnly inserted " provided of course that the examination syllabus is not allowed unduly to dominate the curriculum." As if in an examination of this magnitude it could ever do anything else, as if there were not proof overflowing from the short career of the School Certificate that it must do so, as if the purpose of this great experiment in education were that n boys and girls might be able to present certificates of paltry literary attainment, and $n + 1$ in the succeeding year, so that the schools might be

recognized as increasingly efficient. Here is a field for experiment, if any has ever been presented to the educationists of the nation. And such is the dominance of the examination-cult that our wisest educational brains, in Consultative Committee assembled, must needs kill experiment and initiative dead at the outset by the imposition of an external leaving examination.

Let us turn from considering the faults, and remember before we draw any final conclusion what are the merits of examinations. They are, first, for some purposes quite inevitable: they must always be necessary for admission to the Universities and the professions, as well as for other purposes of selection: they are a very satisfactory test of industry and intelligence, though far less satisfactory in picking out real brains and originality: the qualities which they reveal and reward are by no means despicable, but much to the contrary: they are ability to read a question and answer it clearly, to work to the point, to dismiss the irrelevant, to have knowledge at command, and to work to a limit of time. They keep schools up to a definite standard of duty, and prevent idleness among boys and masters. In addition, an examination of a moderate qualifying standard—and here I put down what I conceive to be the chief merit of the School Certificate—gives to pupils of moderate intellectual ability who will never reach the top of a school, a definite aim which is within their compass. That examination has destroyed and wiped out of

existence those forms which were to be found twenty years ago in every big secondary school, who were a nuisance to themselves and to everybody who had the misfortune to try to teach them, who felt that they were never going to "do any good" at school. These and their like now contentedly pass the School Certificate a year or more later than the average age, and are all the better for the discipline of it.

The merits are therefore considerable, and I can but end this chapter by stating my own personal belief. Up to the age of fifteen a child should not be examined save by his or her teachers—this in the interests of sound teaching: one does not pull up the tender plant to examine its root formation. Thereafter there should be an examination system for the intellectuals, by which I mean, those who are fit for Universities, professions, and the higher posts of industry, manufacture, and commerce. But all the wit of man (and woman) should be used to see that this examination system does not dominate the natural progress nor cramp the variety of the work, nor render impossible that broad general culture which it is the business of secondary schools to impart. For the mass, the great bulk of primary and post-primary children, there should be no examination, but a long period of testing and experiment to find the education which for the child of limited intellectual ability is the best preparation for life. For the examination system is no friend to whom one can trust in blind confidence: from its first guise as a

servant, it may at any moment reveal itself as a hard and unsympathetic master: and it is far the most dangerous of the mechanical instruments which are employed in the service of education.

CHAPTER XIV

THE DANGER FROM MISREPRESENTATION

BEFORE I enter upon the discussion of individualism, the danger which I consider the most serious of those which threaten our education, because it is capable of disintegrating the whole tradition, I would like to clear the ground by stating what that tradition is *not*. I have tried to say what it is, but there are a good many wrong impressions abroad in the popular mind, and some of them are designedly fostered, to gratify prejudice, or to serve political ends. It is alleged, for instance, that, so far as there is any tradition in English education, it is that there should be two educations, the one designed to enable the privileged classes to make a pleasurable use of leisure, and the other designed to qualify the rest of the community to do the work which really maintains the rest. This book will have been written in vain if it fails to make good the case that the old English tradition embodies what may be a national ideal, that it ought not to be the monopoly of any one class, but may well prove a common inheritance and a spiritual bond between all classes of the com-

munity. It is that all should be prepared to do the work for which they are fitted on conditions which leave careers freely open to talent, wherever found, and what is hardly less important, that all should be fitted to make a profitable use of leisure. The common end of the citizen body so trained shall be the removal from human society, so far as may be, of the evils of ill-health and poverty, which are certainly in large measure removable by a society which is sufficiently united, and the provision for all of a sufficiency of leisure. It shall, further, be the end of that education to promote knowledge, and respect for those right values which alone make life in the long run worth living, and leisure worth having.

It will therefore make no terms with the theories, put forward in various and sometimes very persuasive forms, that education shall be utilitarian in spirit and purpose, but nothing more. Sometimes these are not theories, but the voices of unenlightened blunt common sense. "So long as a boy knows how to read and write and figure out a simple sum, what more can he want?" and it is usually added that with the present new-fangled notions in the schools he cannot even do this. But as a matter of truth, even a stupid boy requires a great deal more for life than the three "R's," and it is the business of education to give it to him. Sometimes these are theories emanating from the business world, struck by fear for the loss of our trade, or filled with desire for labour which shall be cheap but

efficient, and it will take every form from suggesting that the staple of a sensible education is shorthand, book-keeping, and commercial French and Spanish to advancing the counter-theory that boys shall learn at school to develop skill with their hands, to mind machines, and to use tools. Sometimes, and in their most persuasive form, they are theories which recognize the truth that the civilization of the future will be more and more built upon applied science, and that this country can only hope to maintain its position in the world by producing, using, and trusting men of first-rate scientific ability. And that indeed is true. Applied science can alone destroy poverty: applied science can alone remove the spectre of ill-health. Nevertheless the deduction is not true that the curriculum of the schools must be so devoted to science that no other subject will be of any comparative importance. It is the business of the schools so to draw their curriculum that no scientific ability runs to waste, but their first business is ever to bear in mind that man cannot live by bread alone, and therefore to teach the children what the true values are. That is the justification of the pursuit at school of what is so often termed "useless knowledge," by which is usually meant knowledge which has no apparent or immediate value in cash. It is doubtful whether any knowledge is useless, though there is knowledge of which the learners make no use. But in any case, the imparting of knowledge is only a part of the

school's business, which is concerned with the whole nature and character of man.

The setting forth of theories of this type is usually combined with attacks on the public schools of the country, of which the first is that their curriculum is obsolete, and that they devote themselves to hammering Latin and Greek into the heads of justifiably recalcitrant boys. The only answer to this line of attack is that what is said is simply not true. Greek is not compulsory for entrance into either Oxford or Cambridge, and still less into any other University in England, and Greek is not compulsory in the public school, nor in the larger majority of cases is it learned at all. Latin is commonly learned, and can justify itself by its intrinsic value, though I shall not turn aside at this point to argue the case for a classical education. What I am concerned to point out, is that the full classical course is followed only by a minority, who have the special gifts which make this for them a desirable course, and since we are the inheritors of a disciplined civilization whose roots lie in Athens, Rome, and Jerusalem, it is as well that there should be in each generation some who are qualified to interpret it afresh from direct knowledge of the original sources. In the great boarding-schools the remainder of the pupils, who constitute in most cases the very large majority, divide themselves between the advanced study of History and its allied subjects, Modern Languages, Mathematics, and several branches of Science. New

combinations are constantly attempted, and new subjects such as the modern conception of geographical study are not discouraged. It is literally true to say that in no schools is greater freedom of choice allowed, and greater variety of courses followed, than in the great schools of old foundation, and their modern progeny, which are so often held up by the ignorant or the malicious as the homes of deliberate intellectual obscurantism.

The other favourite line of attack is that these schools are also the homes of an obsolete discipline, that they believe in, and preach, a crude doctrine of original sin, that they believe that the best method of casting it out is by incessant flogging, that they govern themselves entirely by sanctions of fear, and have neither knowledge of, nor sympathy with, the more enlightened modern doctrine that in the right environment which the true education can create, boys can be taught to do what they ought because they want to do it. This is again an unwarrantable misrepresentation of schools as they are, a distortion of facts the truth about which the critics could easily ascertain, if they were animated by goodwill. Those who are responsible for the conduct of the schools, are perfectly well aware that there have been grave mistakes in the past, and are only too willing to learn anything which modern psychology has to teach. They are incessantly endeavouring to create that kind of environment which makes right growth natural, in which boys

of their own volition will what makes for the good of themselves and the community. Flogging is less and less resorted to as a method of discipline, and it is ridiculous to those that know them to say that the schools are ruled by fear. Nor do they preach any particular brand of the doctrine of original sin, but from the pulpits of most of them, and from the lips of most of the House-masters, you would be likely from time to time to hear the doctrine that we have each of us a higher nature, and a lower nature, and that it is the business of education to help each individual so to live that he will be loyal to his higher nature, and to make him aware of the fact that if he does not, his lower nature may prove the master. And I am very strongly of the opinion that in this form the doctrine of original sin is right, and conveys a truth that we can none of us neglect save at our peril.

These unfair descriptions of the accepted English tradition usually receive point from one-sided and satirical misrepresentations of Arnold, who pays the penalty of being the hero of a cult. Mr. Lytton Strachey set the fashion in his clever, but unjust, study in *Eminent Victorians*, and he has been followed by plenty of others since. Arnold was the man with the puzzled look, who did not know where he was going, the man who, when he was face to face with all the beauty of Lake Como, could only think of moral evil, and the nearness of hell to every one of us. Arnold was a man of his own time, which is not ours,

and he reflects, as we reflect, the circle of ideas amid which he had grown up. It is a monstrous injustice to select some particular idea which we have outgrown, and he had not, and to conceal the truth that he was one of the forces that have helped us to outgrow it. Encouraged by Mr. Lytton Strachey's example, Mr. Bertrand Russell, contemplating the fact that Arnold believed that it was not a personal degradation for a small boy to be caned, and was a bit gloomy at Lake Como, proceeds to write: "It is pathetic to see this naturally kindly gentleman lashing himself *into a mood of sadism*, in which he can flog little boys *without compunction*, and all under the impression that he is conforming to the religion of Love. It is pathetic when we consider the deluded individual: but it is tragic *when we think of the generations of cruelty that he put into the world* by creating an atmosphere of abhorrence of 'moral evil.'" The italics are mine, for I wish to draw attention to the ludicrous unfairness of the passage. It makes one almost hold one's head in amazement that these words could be written of a man whose life's work demonstrably resulted in making English schools more humane, more cultured, and more religious. Far more true than the cleverly-selected strokes of Mr. Lytton Strachey's satire, or the blunt perversion of facts of Mr. Bertrand Russell, is the impression that Arnold made on his gifted son, himself the apostle of sweetness and light, that he was a natural leader, whose mission it was to "stablish the wavering files"

of marching humanity, and to head them in the pilgrimage towards the City of God.

I propose in this chapter to take Mr. Bertrand Russell as the example of what I hold to be the unfair line of attack on the old educational tradition, and also as the apostle of that individualism which I regard as at the present day its greatest danger. I do so because he writes clearly and well, and leaves one in no doubt as to his meaning: he knows what he is after, he is not afraid of bold statements, and it is a delight to him to shock the orthodox. In an apparently judicial passage he writes: "Dr. Arnold's system, which has remained in force in English public schools to the present day, had another defect, namely that it was aristocratic. The aim was to train men for positions of authority and power, whether at home, or in distant parts of the empire. An aristocracy, if it is to survive, needs certain virtues: these were to be imparted at school. The product was to be energetic, stoical, physically fit, possessed of certain unalterable beliefs, with high standards of rectitude, and convinced that it had an important mission in the world. To a surprising extent, those results were achieved. Intellect was sacrificed to them, because intellect might produce doubt. Sympathy was sacrificed, because it might interfere with governing 'inferior' races or classes. Kindliness was sacrificed for the sake of roughness: imagination, for the sake of firmness. . . . The complexity of the modern world increasingly requires

intelligence, and Dr. Arnold sacrificed intelligence to 'virtue.' The battle of Waterloo may have been won on the playing-fields of Eton, but the British Empire is being lost there."

In this passage the first sentence seems to me to contain, or to suggest, two misstatements. It suggests that Arnold consciously invented a system, which has never been changed, when as a matter of history it has constantly adapted itself to new conditions, and is now something remarkably different from what it was, as any living thing in the course of a century might be expected to become. It misrepresents the fact that Arnold borrowed from the aristocracy their method of training children, and applied it to the sons of the middle-class. It was indeed part of the profound social revolution which accompanied reform. The next sentence represents him as training men for positions of power, when what he did was to train them for the service of their country: there is a very great difference in the two ways of putting the same thing. It is then suggested that an ideal, now assumed to have been consciously devised to serve the interests of aristocracy, was put before a privileged class: it is concealed that there was then in existence no elementary education, and that the democracy had not come into being, and it is assumed that this ideal was not capable of being transferred to all schools. There follow later a few bold and crushing sentences in which the services of the middle-class to the empire in the nineteenth

century are dismissed with contempt. Intellect, we are told, was sacrificed because intellect might produce doubt. As to this, it can only be said that the schools neither did this consciously nor did they do it unconsciously: I am afraid that it is simply not true, save in so far as the English do not place pure intellect first in the qualities which they honour. These men who went out from our schools in the latter part of the nineteenth century, we are next told, had neither sympathy, kindliness, nor imagination, because they were deliberately intended to be firm and tough governors of inferior races. Yet kindly sympathy was just the quality which the race of men produced by this school-tradition contributed to the service of the empire. They made of India a country where men can walk in peace, and trade can flourish, and justice be done, and they so bore themselves that many won the devotion of the "inferior" race: if they fell short of this, it was because they belied the tradition of their bringing-up, not because they kept it. They stand there to-day, as they have stood for a century, and preserve a vast and unwarlike population from becoming the easy prey of riders from the hills, and soldiers from the fortresses of ancient tyranny. They have learned increasingly to share power, and their difficulties are created by the education which they first made possible, and the political training which they first gave. Is there in this work no sympathy and no imagination? Or if we look to

another part of the world, to Khartoum of unhappy memory, we see a country which was given over to rapine and slavery transformed in a generation into a country which is so thoroughly pacified that even the Great War could hardly disturb it. Forty years ago the whole dark continent in those vast interiors of the unknown was sodden with blood and misery. To-day it has been opened out, partly by missionaries drawn from this unsympathetic and unkindly breed, partly by civil services recruited from the same unpromising material: roads have been made, railways built, and steamers set on the lakes: the slave-trader can only exercise his calling in districts which are remote and unknown. It is of course true that there are Englishmen who are out to exploit the native, and who regard him as an inferior with no rights that may conflict with his own. But it is unfair to describe unfavourable specimens of this type as the typical product of the school system, when it is entirely owing to the ideal of service inculcated in the schools that the acquisitive exploiter has on the whole been so successfully held in check. It is part of the Covenant of the League of Nations that territories inhabited by backward races shall be handed over in trusteeship to great Powers, who shall from time to time give account of their stewardship, shall govern in the interest of the governed, and so seek to develop them that they shall in time be able to stand upon their own feet, and determine for themselves their own destiny.

That this should be considered a feasible policy, worthy of being made a deliberately planned part of the international system which the League of Nations was meant to inaugurate, is due to the record of administration set up in the presence of the world by this very class which is so contemptuously dismissed as devoid of intellect and imagination, without sympathy and without kindliness.

Finally, it is said in the passage which I have quoted that the complexity of the modern world increasingly requires intelligence, and Dr. Arnold, who continues to be picked out as the "only-begetter" of the whole system, sacrificed intelligence to "virtue." He did not sacrifice intelligence to virtue, but he put virtue first: he would have been immensely surprised if he had been told that the two qualities were mutually exclusive. It is true that Kingsley advised the young ladies of the mid-Victorian epoch to be good, and to let who can be clever, but it is doubtful whether his advice carried complete conviction at the time, even in the ears of his sweet auditors: they probably felt that there was a catch somewhere. And there is a catch which manifests itself again in the passage under review. To put first things first, and second things second, is not to sacrifice the second to the first, but to put things in their proper places. Virtue and intelligence can perfectly well coexist, and a man has not a second-rate mind because he happens to believe in God and a moral order. But a non-moral intelligence can certainly exist, and it has always been held

in the English tradition to be a very dangerous thing. As to the remaining sentence, which is an epigram that in one form or another has done such frequent service that it has lost its first edge, I have already said that I cannot attach any meaning whatever to the statement that the Battle of Waterloo was won on the playing-fields of Eton, and that I have grave doubts whether the statement was ever made. I am equally at a loss to attach meaning to the statement that the British Empire is being lost there. I did not know that it was being lost, but I do know that it is being transformed in the spirit which is the logical working-out of the spirit of freedom and self-determination for which England at its best has stood and will stand. But if the writer merely meant that the system of government without intelligence and without imagination, without sympathy and kindliness, is breaking down, and coming to an end, I should have expected him to show real gratitude to the playing-fields of Eton which are bringing about so beneficent a result. If he really means, however, that excessive devotion to the cult of athleticism is impairing the ideal of culture and knowledge, I should be inclined to be in agreement, and in order to agree in one point at any rate, I will take that to be the true meaning, even though the writer somewhat illogically used the idea merely as a handy stick with which to beat an animal in which he was going to allow no good points whatever.

The individualist is instinctively made angry by the mere mention of social virtues, and he can make no use of the group-loyalties which would seem to limit, or to interfere with, his sacred right to self-realization. His method is therefore always to describe them in accordance with some degenerate manifestation of the quality, some falling-off from its real nature, which he thereafter takes as a complete description of the whole. It is so that the old English tradition of education is dealt with: let us take one more instance, and have done. "Those who regard it," says Mr. Russell, "as one of the purposes of male education to produce men willing to kill and be killed for frivolous reasons are clearly deficient in diffused parental feeling: yet they control education in all civilized countries except Denmark and China." The respect for human life prevalent in China is, of course, notorious, but I will not dwell upon Denmark's odd bedfellow. But I should have thought that the otherwise complete agreement of the civilized races of mankind would have led Mr. Russell to pause before he described the teaching of patriotism as the production by education of men willing to kill and be killed for frivolous reasons. *εἷς οἰωνος ἄριστος ἀμύνεσθαι περὶ πάτρης*; it is a clear call in the dawn of song, that it is a noble thing to lay down one's life for one's country. It has never ceased to wake an echo in every generous heart: *pro patria mori*—in Greece, in Rome, in all civilized countries, the tombs of the men who

have so died have been the tombs that men have delighted to honour, because those that lie there have walked the road of self-sacrifice. Does the writer really think that it is an adequate account of the Englishmen who fell in the Great War and of the French, the Germans, the Russians, that these were merely the blind products of a system, men willing to kill and be killed for frivolous reasons? And when perhaps on the Indian frontier "two thousand pounds of education drops to a ten-rupee jezail," does he think it a mere piece of silliness, a pathetic waste by an individual of his own chances of self-realization, and not an act of self-sacrifice in the cause of civilization which ennobles the individual who by doing his duty has set the example? That wars may cease in the world, and all roads be open in peace even to the ends of the earth, is an ideal towards which all men of goodwill may set their faces not without hope of accomplishing the journey: but they will not go far by the method of deriding old heroisms and belittling the sacrifices of gallant men. Let us rather say, the old ideal was noble, let us join together and build a nobler yet. It is not an act of intelligence, it is indeed an insult to intelligence, to represent Leonidas as a fool, and to hold up for our admiration the diffused parental feeling of the governing classes of—China.

CHAPTER XV

THE DANGER FROM INDIVIDUALISM

INDIVIDUALISM is a philosophy of life which has adherents in every age, and at rare intervals becomes dominant. It has little survival value, for it disintegrates a society. Just as the collections of families which had a weak tribal sense fell under the dominion of those in which the tribal sense was strong, or perished before them, so the nation or civilization in which individualism is dominant must give way before the thrust and united vigour of a rival which is swayed by a common moral and political ideal. The individualist may think that he is the more perfect product of time, and in some cases he may be: none the less he does not survive for long. It is as if Nature, in contemplating this late growth, concluded that it would not do, and started on a new line of experiment. The products of the free individualism of fourth-century Greece were from some points of view admirable, but they could stand neither against Macedon nor Rome, which with less intellectual power possessed a national ideal of conduct to which they were loyal: the survival value of "virtue" is greater than that of intellect. It

is a plain but unpalatable truth that our own country, if it surrenders its education to the principles of individualism, will fail to hold its own in comparison with such countries as the United States, at the crude patriotism of which our intellectuals laugh, or with Germany with its instinctive loyalty to the State and the national "Kultur," or with Japan in which the individual is taught to believe that he counts for nothing. The process of individualistic decay is not inevitable, as some think. It can be arrested by a national education consciously directed to an end, the preservation of what is noblest in the national character, that which the Romans called "virtue." Nor does this ideal of education conflict with true internationalism, that co-operation of the peoples where each shall be free to contribute its own special contribution to the well-being of a world. The practical question for us is whether we are to seek by our education to produce a true Englishman, or a denationalized European: if it is to be the latter, the player will in no long time return the pieces to the box, and continue the game with another set.

I shall borrow the statement of the creed of Individualism from Mr. Bertrand Russell's book *On Education*, because it is there put with uncompromising clearness, and much attractive persuasiveness. It is based upon three propositions. The first is that there can be no agreement between an education, the object of which is the instilling of beliefs, and an education, the

object of which is to produce independence of judgment. The second is that the individual is always an end in himself, better than State and Church: he is never to be treated as a means. The third is that the basis of the ideal character will be found in the four qualities of vitality, courage, sensitiveness, and intelligence, a list from which virtue is consciously excluded. "The Greeks," says Mr. Russell, "did not err in this respect, but the Church led men to think that nothing matters except virtue, and virtue consists in abstinence from a certain list of actions arbitrarily labelled 'sin.'"

Let us, then, consider the first proposition that there can be no compromise possible between the two educations, that which seeks to instil belief, and that which aims at independence of judgment. It is surely too sharp a dichotomy, and thinks of the individual as an abstraction, something capable of functioning *in vacuo*, ἢ θηρίον ἢ θεός, brute, or god, as Aristotle said, but not any human being that we know. Every human being is the product of a society, a composite of inherited qualities, both family and racial: he is born into a society to which his whole life must be relative. The life of that society cannot be lived, if each member is to be taught that every rule of the game is a matter of individual opinion, and that he may play or not play, observe the rule or ignore it, as he sees fit on inquiry in the court of his own conscience. One might as well try to play a game

of cricket in which every boy was free to bat, and not field, or to bowl and not bat, or go home to tea whenever he felt hot. There is an inherited system of morality, which represents the experience of the race, the rules which our ancestors have found to govern the game, and there is a racial character, a setting towards some ideals, and not others, towards qualities and types of pursuits which appeal to Frenchmen, and not Englishmen, or to Englishmen, and not Frenchmen, which is not so fundamentally important, but is part of the inheritance of the individual. It is the business of education to make the individual aware of the fundamental rules which alone make co-operation, and an orderly life in the community possible: it is also its business to set before him the racial ideal by enlightened study of the nation's history and the aims which have inspired the great men which it has produced, and delights to honour. The rules are set forth, for instance, in the ten commandments. Is it the business of education to leave the advisability of theft, or murder, or adultery to the independent judgment, or should it instil the belief, that they cannot be practised in any society which is to maintain itself above the level of barbarism? Is it possible to teach history without bringing out that obedience to the call of duty is a quality which the English have specially admired, that, for instance, the soldiers who stood firm in their ranks on the sinking *Birkenhead*, while the women and children

were saved, were wholly admirable ? They were not individualists indeed, for then the spectacle would have been altogether less pleasant. Is it really possible to leave the estimation of such an incident to the independent judgment ? This is only a single instance of what might be paralleled in all the branches of the nation's past activity, not only in the region of the practical, but in art and thought and religion. It is impossible to teach without instilling beliefs, even if you mistakenly set out to teach the belief that one ought to have an open mind about everything, and that morality is an arbitrary set of "taboos," under the impression that you are creating independence of judgment. Education should continue to transfer to each growing generation the inherited experience of the race, and the knowledge of the principles which lie at the foundation of social life. And this, if you like, is virtue, and this virtue can be, and ought to be, taught.

Nor does it really interfere with the production of independence of judgment, nor is this a quality to which, as a matter of history, Englishmen have been taught in the past to deny, the tribute of admiration. We have only to consider the frequency of such phrases on English lips as "I like him, for he has at any rate the courage of his convictions"; "He has his back to the wall, but he won't give in"; "He has a mind of his own," right on to the often-quoted words of Tennyson: "Because right is right, to follow

right were wisdom in the scorn of consequence." To have learned the rules of a game is no reason why one should never attempt to improve the rules. Capablanca is a master of chess, who has absorbed all the rules and the bookwork: he has had all the beliefs due to past experience thoroughly instilled into him. He feels that the game needs reform, but he does not propose that the moves of the pieces should henceforth be a matter of opinion and of independent judgment, though there are many occasions on which such liberty would save the individual from suffering severe consequences. That liberty would be gained at the price of there ceasing to be a game at all. He has proposed instead a board with a hundred squares, and with new pieces, a game for supermen. Exactly in the same way will true independence of judgment function by building upon what is old, by keeping the rules, and by meeting the growing complexity of life with more complex arrangements. It may be that humanity in the future will, as compared with ourselves, be a race of supermen, but they will not come into existence at all if society is first to be reduced to a form of association which has no absolute standards anywhere.

The second article of the creed, as I have quoted it, is that the individual is an end in himself, and never a means: he is of more value than State or Church. Here again the man of practical interests may feel not unreasonably that we are moving in a remote region of philo-

sophical abstraction, and that there is no such thing as an individual, separate from a State, or a Church, or some form of human association. He may think that as a matter of educational practice it may be quite possible to give full value to the individual as an end in himself, and yet subserve the interests of the State or the Church or whatever it may be. It may even be possible that the highest interests of the individual as an end in himself may only be realizable in such an association, and that the command to love one another, and not ourselves, in however enlightened a manner, may prove the more lasting wisdom. But what the theory presumably means is that where the interests of the individual, and his freedom of self-development, seem to be in conflict with the claims or interest of any society outside himself, of which he is a member, the claims and interest of that society ought to give way. This is indeed not a new theory: it is one which humanity has frequently discarded, because it does not work in practice. It is the teaching of a high form of Epicureanism, and it is in the same lofty guise that Mr. Russell presents it to his readers: it is by no means presented as the ethics of a low hedonism, and as a primrose path to follow. There may be some who would think that in England, if we are to have individualism, Stoicism would be a better form for it to take, since it faces the hard facts of life more adequately, and is better suited to the nations which are gifted with genius for

action : Stoicism suited Rome, and it has suited some Englishmen.

But that is a side issue. We have to realize that this creed of life is presented to us on the basis of what is called a new conception of discipline, and we have to recognize and admit that this conception of discipline has much in it that is true, and of great value. It dismisses the old and bad idea that discipline must rest on fear and purely external compulsion. It grasps the truth that when a child has been taught to see the reason of a rule, to acquiesce in it, and to approve it, then he wills that rule, and in obeying it only obeys himself, and remains as free as before. This is called a new discipline, but it is not really new : it is, for instance, in the New Testament. But it had been forgotten, and it has been rediscovered. It is known once again that in the right environment, and under the influence of friendship and love, a child will come to like the right things, and desire them. This is good and true, but it is not quite all the truth : there is danger in this very attractive garden to which Madame Montessori is held to have opened the gate in this generation. *Surgit amari aliquid, quod in ipsis floribus angit.* The emphasis in this theory comes to be wrongly stressed. The child is trained by skilful environment to like the right things, but in the long run the child grown man comes to say, not good is what I like, but what I like is good. He puts into practice the sacred right of private judgment,

which he has been taught to place before everything, and, being human, he always finds abundant reasons for thinking that his own case is the exception which proves the rule for other people. Nothing can prevent the progressive debasement of this ideal. The enlightened followers of Epicurus may pitch their camp high on the mountain-side, blown upon by all the winds of truth and freedom. In a generation that camp will be found far down on the richer and warmer slopes; by the time of the second generation it will be found in the valley.

I turn to the third article, that the basis of the ideal character is compact of the four qualities of vitality, courage, sensitiveness, and intelligence, a highly-strung ideal, with which no one would be inclined to quarrel save for its incompleteness. The ordinary person would say that of course you presuppose virtue, and he would receive a great surprise on finding that virtue is designedly and deliberately omitted. This is again not a new ideal: it must have been formulated many times, wherever clever men have felt a curb from outside upon what they have judged to be in their case perfectly natural and reasonable instincts. It was certainly formulated among the Greeks, and in some cases acted on, by Alcibiades, for instance: it is the subject of more than one discussion in the dialogues of Plato, whose mouthpiece, Socrates, finds reasons for holding it to be thoroughly unsatisfactory. For the Greeks were concerned with virtue, and

adopted no theory in their great period which had no place for moral excellence. This is, indeed, historically, not a democratic ideal at all, nor do I believe that it can ever be captured from its natural owners by democracy: certainly I very much hope that it will not be. It is the ideal of an aristocracy of the intellect, of the intelligentsia, who have taken a lease of the good things of life, and who have come to think that right and wrong are purely matters of opinion. It can coexist with great achievement in the region of art, of science, and of scholarship. It did so at the time of the Renaissance, which contributed so much to learning and art, but not a single constructive idea to human society. It has been more than once pointed out that Benvenuto Cellini is the most typical product of that period, supreme artist and craftsman, and that he simply did not know the difference between right and wrong. He had, however, to a high degree the four qualities which are here held up to our admiration. The same, at a lower level indeed, can be asserted of our own English society among the Court aristocracy after the Restoration. Rochester and his circle had vitality, courage, sensitiveness, and intelligence, but they stopped there, just as Mr. Russell's ideal stops there. A community of men and women possessing these qualities, and also holding the view that virtue is a matter of opinion, would indeed, as Mr. Russell says, be something very different from anything that

has hitherto existed. It would be very different indeed if it were coextensive with a nation. But it has existed more than once in the shape of an aristocracy, or an intelligentsia, and it has not left a very inviting record behind it.

But, we are told, it was the Church that was the offender. "The Church led men to think that nothing matters except virtue, and virtue consists in abstinence from a certain list of actions arbitrarily labelled sin." Notice the slipping in of the word arbitrarily, and the omission of the detail of the actions condemned. But let us consider them in detail, as they are written down, for instance, in the fifth chapter of the Epistle to the Galatians: "Now the works of the flesh are manifest, which are these: Adultery, fornication, uncleanness, lasciviousness, idolatry, witchcraft, hatred, variance, emulations, wrath, strife, seditions, heresies, envyings, murders, drunkenness, revellings, and such like: of the which I tell you before, as I have also told you in time past, that they which do such things shall not inherit the Kingdom of God. But the fruit of the Spirit is love, joy, peace, long-suffering, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness, temperance: against such there is no law." Can it be reasonably said that the first list enumerates actions which are arbitrarily labelled sin? Does it not sum up the verdict of the experience of the whole human race that these are actions, which, if habitually committed, "embody and embrute" the higher nature of

man? Do they not with perfect frankness and clearness enumerate the things which are to be avoided, and the things which are to be sought, stating the rules which are to be observed, if those desirable qualities, vitality, courage, sensitiveness, and intelligence, are to prove a blessing, and not a curse, to their possessors and to society. One cannot resist the conclusion that virtue alone gives them value.

The English tradition of education contains within it the means of developing the qualities that are desired through those elements of the ideal which it associates with discipline, culture, and athletics, but it completes the good character by adding the qualities which are associated with religion and service. I can but repeat my conviction that a nation possesses, and cannot help possessing, a history and tradition which have been partly shaped by the national character, and have partly moulded that character in return. Any education worthy of the name national must have reference to that. The society which the nation constitutes, in which alone most individuals can live their lives, is based on a morality which is partly perhaps national, but in its main features universal, and common to all civilized races. By accepting that morality, and by loyalty to the highest ideals of the nation-group to which he belongs, the individual can find the highest realization of his own personality, and it is not probable that he will find an equal expression of himself along any other road. By rejecting that morality,

and by disloyalty to the national ideals, the individual, if he is successful, merely breaks up and disintegrates what for his fellow-citizens are the conditions for good and effective living.

The revolt usually centres itself in the question of the relation of the sexes, and it is not unusual for the modern preachers of individualism to make their attack on morality at this point, and to describe it as no more than an ancient system of "taboos." The fact that in the past there has been much hypocrisy, and that dishonesty, prudery, and piety have made an unholy alliance to burke discussion, and to conceal abuses, has provided the critics with plenty of weapons in the shape of apt instances that cannot be denied. The partner tied for life to the lunatic or the drunkard has been a convenient cover for suggesting, what is true, that the marriage-law was made for man, and not man for the marriage-law, and for further suggesting, what is not true, that the marriage-law of monogamy, and of chastity outside the state of marriage, need not be observed further than may be convenient to any individual of either sex. These are, we are told, in other words, to have the right to exercise independent judgment, though there is no matter in which judgment in one's own case is less likely to be independent and impartial than in a matter of sexual temptation. There is no ground upon which human society can stand firmly in this matter, between the institution which is based on the indissoluble character of marriage, and the

sanctity of the family and its claims, on the one hand, and that system of free love or selective breeding, coupled with the institution of State nurseries which was at one time advocated by Plato. This statement is not intended to mean that divorce can never be justified. But it is intended to state that failure to be loyal to the institution of marriage on the part of one partner is disastrous to the children of that partnership, deprives them of an element which they have a natural right to expect in their home, and inevitably sends them out into life with an outlook which is warped or embittered. Once again virtue does not seem to be a matter of opinion, but to be the result of watching the working out of causes and effects, as they operate upon human nature. And if as a matter of observed truth, that which I suppose I am to call an old-fashioned saying is demonstrably true, namely that the wages of sin is death, then I consider that an education is certainly deficient in its treatment of those whom it educates if it fails to tell them so.

We live in an ancient society which has to adjust itself to complex new conditions, which are shaping themselves and very rapidly becoming urgent in their pressure, and the whole machine is full of stresses and strains. Sometimes the life of those who for no fault of their own are imperfectly adjusted is unhappy. But there is nothing like so much unhappiness as there would be, if the whole world were to be filled with

brave and intelligent people, full of vitality, all seeking their own happiness in defiance of all ancient "taboos," if so I am to describe what we have hitherto known as virtue. The structure of human society, as we know it in Western Europe, a structure built by Rome, but illuminated by the ideals of Christ and enriched by the intelligence of Greece, and the contributions of many nations since, this Catholic tradition, touched by romance and chivalry, is something that we cannot light-heartedly throw away in order to follow a vision of individualism, however fair the colours in which it may be painted. The will-o'-the-wisp, as always, floats over ground where the footing is not secure.

There must always be a profound difference between those who believe in God, active and loving, fulfilling Himself in humanity, and offering the gift of eternal life, and those who believe that death closes all, and that God is an illusion of self-portraiture thrown on the void by the human consciousness. On the latter view the thought of the individual as an end in himself cannot be very impressive, but it may be all that there is: it cannot inspire the majority of men to an ideal higher than that of eating and drinking, since to-morrow we die. Even if this life is all that there is, I would argue that it is better to accept the education and the ideals which have reference to society: it is better to teach the child not to seek the self-realization of the individual self, but to live as a member of a com-

munity, to be loyal to its laws, to seek to remove its injustices and its imperfections, and to deserve well of his fellow-men. Such a one will not have the inspiration of the Cross of Christ, but he may well stumble on the truth that he, who loses his own life, shall find it. Individualism can be certainly trusted to make manifest to him the converse of that truth, that he, who seeks his own life, shall lose it. This is the ideal of service which is the rarest fruit of the English tradition of education, and it is that by which the democracy of the future can alone live. Individualism, that despises virtue, will destroy it before two generations are passed.

PART III

THINGS THAT MAY BE

CHAPTER XVI

DEMOCRACY AND KNOWLEDGE

I PUT forward the ideal of the highest English tradition, of that education which trains a generation through religion and discipline, through culture of the mind and perfection of the body, to a conscious end of service to the community, as an ideal which shall inspire the whole of our education in every type of school, and create the democracy of the future. There is nothing in it, I repeat, which is the monopoly of any type of school, or of any class in the community. I have been frank in setting out the defects which I believe are to be observed in every branch of our national system, and I am not holding up one type of school as a model, and bidding the rest to imitate it. I have before my mind a vision of many schools which shall each set before themselves the same ideal, and shall through varying circumstances and in diverse ways give their own interpretation of it. It will be a system which seeks at all its stages to get rid of exclusiveness and privilege, but it will face facts. It will realize that it is in the nature of simple justice that all should have the same chance, and, so far as may be, it will seek to provide it,

but it will recognize the truth that nature has not created them equal, and that equality of opportunity can never mean equality of performance. Infinite is the variety of the mental and physical endowments of individuals, and as infinite are the forms of service to which these gifts can be devoted. Ability of every kind is produced in a certain, but not too abundant, measure by every social class of the community, and the nation needs, more than it ever did before, the use and service of every ounce of trained ability that it can get. The schools of the democracy should therefore seek to be of the utmost variety, but should eschew from the outset that perversion of democratic theory which levels the best down to the standard of the average, and destroys idiosyncrasies in favour of a dull normality. We do not want schools according to a formula, and the last place in which we want mass-production is in education. Because we are working quickly, and working on a very large scale, we are in danger of producing it, and mistaking it for efficiency, but true education will always remain the sphere of the artist and the craftsman.

I have a vision of a teaching profession which shall be a single service, not because the names of all who teach are written down in one column of a single register, but because they are bound together by a single spirit in the service of a common ideal. One grade will not look askance at the other, nor will individuals continue to regard their own schools as fortresses from which

with the drawbridge raised they look out over the walls at rivals and possible enemies, thanking God the while that they are not as other men are, nor the "parents" of their children like the "parents" of those other children. There shall come a time, perhaps, when it will be recognized not only in word, but in fact, that every branch of the teaching profession, and every type of school, can render equal service, since that service will be relative to the common ideal which all seek to follow. It will be recognized, for instance, perhaps, that the most honourable, because the most critical and most permanent, work is done by the teachers in infant and nursery schools, that it is possible that the first five years of life count for more than any other five, and that the remaining stages of education should be the working out of lines which have been truly and accurately drawn in early childhood. The schools will be free, by which I mean that those who teach in them will be free, to try every kind of experiment which their experience has led them to believe valuable. It may be that from time to time tares will be planted among the wheat, but we shall follow the wise course of allowing both to grow together until the harvest: for, like the crops of the earth, the harvest of education will be tested by the quality of its yield. Very few can be originators: but just as in the modern State there should be a department of agriculture whose business is to discover what kinds of grain in a particular soil give the heaviest

yield, and are most resistant to disease, and what kinds are better suited to other soils, so in the infinitely more various culture of human minds and characters there should be a central body to encourage every variety of trial, and to record what types of school, what forms of curriculum, what element of the ideal, when most stressed, produce the best results in practice.

I have a vision of a system in which the teachers are free, because they are trusted, in which it is realized that the results that are desired cannot arise at all, unless the teachers are free, and are trusted. The teachers on their part would enter on their profession with a sense of vocation, as strong a sense of vocation, in time to come, as that with which the ministers of the Churches enter upon their life's work. They will not enter it merely because it represents a safe competence, because the holidays are good, because there is nothing else obvious to do, and because this may as well be done as anything else. They will know that there is an art to be practised, and a life to be lived, in the face of critics, involuntary, clear-sighted, and severe, if one fails, or disciples generous and loyal, if one succeeds. What for the teacher is most difficult, and when realized, most deterring, is that the most valuable elements of the ideal must be imparted, not by talking about them, but by example: the work of the teacher is a test, not so much of intellect, as of personality. As the teaching profession more and more rises to the height of its true work,

from a routine of grammar-grinding to the inspiration of a national character, and the setting of true values in the heart of a people, so will it rise in status and honour, and the democracy of the future will recognize that no profession is more necessary to the well-being of the whole than that of the teachers. Schoolmasters have been in the past the butt of literature and the subject of derision in every form which it can take, from good humour to anger and bitterness, because as a profession they have deserved it, and for so long a period from Tudor to modern days fell short of any ideal which men can honour and respect.

This is, indeed, the greatest issue, but the education which I see in my vision, and which this profession of teachers of a single ideal will give, will be more flexible and more varied than any that has yet been known. We who teach are the products of an academic curriculum: we have for the most part been fond of books, and gone through school to a University: we quite naturally make it the end of education to produce as many as possible like ourselves. We have gone far enough along this line. We are flooding the country with third-rate Bachelors of Arts and Science of both sexes, who are mere memorizers of second-hand information, and the possession of a University degree has come to mean as much, or as little, as in another sphere is meant by a membership of the Order of the British Empire. But a nation is not better

educated for life because it has more B.A.'s to the acre than any other. The task before the teaching profession is something much harder, to make the educational system a great sorting-house of different kinds of ability, to give to each the training on the intellectual side which is the most fitting and the most fruitful, but to impart to all the common national ideal, and with it to give that respect for knowledge which the nation does not possess, and, as yet, has never possessed.

This may seem a hard saying, but I do not regard it as an exaggeration. I mean simply that the average Englishman does not regard it as at all important that he should gain as much knowledge as he can for the purpose of the efficient conduct of life. Intellectual discussion always makes him uneasy, and he will go away talking about "high-brows." One has only to think of the conversation of the average dinner-table, club, afternoon tea-party, and railway carriage to realize that it does not usually betray much sense of the value of knowledge, or even interest in it. It is supposed to be bad form to talk "shop," though in the modern division of knowledge this usually means that the only subject upon which we have knowledge, as compared with vague impressions, is barred, and instead we talk of sport, the weather, and the latest "stunt" of the newspapers. Bishop Creighton once pointed out the truth of what I am here maintaining and said: "If you are

inclined to demur to that statement, I would ask you to consider what are the qualities on which Englishmen pride themselves. You know the familiar list—vigour, energy, practical capacity, dogged perseverance, determination not to be beaten, integrity, a love of justice, outspokenness, straightforwardness, and the rest. These are all excellent qualities, but you will observe that they are all practical and not intellectual. They omit all reference to thought and its processes, to knowledge and its reward."

We stand upon the threshold of a new era of control and security such as the human race has not known. We may indeed be prevented from entering that promised land by the strife of classes for the possession of wealth, and by the strife of nations for the possession of power. But granted that these dangers can be avoided, as by wisdom they surely can be, it is not realized enough that the control and security which will characterize that age will be entirely built upon knowledge and its application, and it will depend upon knowledge again, and upon education, whether the opportunity of that more favourable life will be used or misused. It will mean handing over life to the guidance of those who know, not to those who are amateurs at improvisation, however brilliant, or to those who with stoical perseverance under hard knocks are content to muddle through. One of the first possibilities of the future is the production of a healthy population, in which disease will be far rarer, life more prolonged

and more vigorous, and only natural decay not averted. This prospect has been opened out to us because by discovering the laws of sanitation we first began to apply knowledge to shape the material environment of life, and from that has come not a mere sanitary science of uncontaminated water supply and efficient sewers, but the certainty that children can be so dealt with, and so taught, that a virtually new race can be created. But it will mean steady, clear-headed following of knowledge, not opinion. The school medical service has already become the grand inquest of a nation, and by observation, experiment, and the application of science is laying the foundation of the national health. "In former times," I quote from *The Health of the School Child*, the annual report of the Chief Medical Officer of the Board of Education for the year 1927, "even down to fifty years ago, the duty and scope of the public health service was to provide a sanitary environment for the people. Housing, clean streets, water supply, drainage and sewerage, refuse removal, disinfection, quarantine, the isolation hospital and Poor Law relief constituted the principal programme. But the advance of medicine and surgery has built upon that foundation a new superstructure. For now the sphere of the public health service, though still to maintain a sanitary environment, is also concerned with maternity and motherhood, the protection of infancy and childhood, health insurance, industrial welfare, dietary and food supply,

international health, the direct treatment and prevention of disease—tuberculosis, rickets, venereal disease, diphtheria, typhoid, cancer, rheumatism—the creation of the great public medical services, the restoration of the cripple, the re-education of the blind, and above all the establishment of a healthy way of life. It is a new kind of emancipation, the aim of which is not the improvement of the externals of man's life alone, but the improvement of man himself, the prolongation of his days, the strengthening of his physique, the gift of health, the enlargement of his capacity. Milton's 'betterment of man's estate' is giving way to the betterment of man: sanitation is surpassed by social evolution." It is a great hope: it depends entirely on the discovery of knowledge, and the application of knowledge not only by doctors to patients, but by each one of us to himself, and to our children.

In this coming age we are aware that the human race may for the first time shake off poverty, the danger of not having enough. We are not entering upon the tenancy of a sort of Tom Tiddler's ground, where every one can be rich for the asking, and without doing any work for it: that would be in any case a disastrous country for humanity. But a time when there will be a sufficiency for all who work is within reach. We know that by the application of science to agriculture, and by the application of science to the transformation of raw materials into articles of consumption, we can produce enough. Once

again we are faced by the uncompromising fact that only by knowledge and the application of knowledge can these things be. Nothing is going to give us enough if we do not know enough to produce it, and no political theories as to the distribution of the product are going to change that basic fact. The qualities by which our nation can make itself richer are in the main three. It has not got enough of them at the present time, and it will only get more of them by education. Those three qualities are temperance, industry, and the habit of co-operation. I am not a believer in compulsory temperance, but I do not shut my eyes to the fact that the nation could drink a good deal less without hurting anyone but the Trade, and with considerable benefit to many individual purses. I have also the impression that every class of the community could work harder, again without hurting anyone, and could take a greater interest and pride in work, and not dismiss it as a necessary drudgery to be reduced to the least possible amount. I have not been able to escape the obvious deductions to be drawn from the industrial history of this century, that an incessant succession of strikes and lock-outs is not the best method of building up a lasting prosperity, or of establishing continuous command of growing markets. To whatever theory for the distribution of the product we may come, industrial welfare must be built upon co-operation, and can be built upon nothing else. It will, moreover,

be co-operation under the direction of those who know, work directed by knowledge. True education alone can make people temperate, industrious, and ready to co-operate, and I do not know anything else that will, for these qualities are none of them instincts of unregenerate human nature.

This country is an overpopulated island, overpopulated in the sense that it cannot hope to maintain more than a proportion of the whole from the products of its own soil: it must, therefore, continue to maintain them by keeping in the markets of the world that leading position which has brought this population into being. If we had never become a "nation of shopkeepers," there might be eight or ten millions of people in these islands: but there are forty millions or more, whose existence and welfare depend upon our continuing to keep shop successfully. We can do so, only if we gain knowledge, and apply it, more earnestly and continuously than we have done hitherto. It is unnecessary to recapitulate the history of the Industrial Revolution, when this country became the home of invention at a time when the Continent was wasted by war and revolution, and when maritime supremacy assured to us the carrying trade of the world. Favourable circumstances gave us a long start, and the riches which were heaped into the lap of England were taken to be the natural tribute to an industrial superiority innate in the race instead of the natural working-out of a position which was in large measure one of

fortuitous advantage. The prosperous merchant and manufacturer of the nineteenth century did not value knowledge, nor, as he watched his growing bank-balances, did he feel the lack of education. But other races learned his secrets, and began to copy his methods. In particular the industrious German began to be a threatening, and sometimes a successful, rival in many markets overseas, not because, as used to be contemptuously said, what he made was "cheap and nasty," but because he sought knowledge with infinite labour, and took no less infinite trouble to apply it in detail. The South African War shook our complacency, and taught a good many people that we had been living on our gains, by no means only in the world of commerce and industry. The Great War dispersed our accumulated savings, and loaded us with an immense burden of debt. Simultaneously the basis of industry was transferred from coal to oil and electrical power, where we are no longer in a favourable position as compared with any of our competitors.

The Great War made it clear, if it was ever in doubt, that the nation was not lacking in power of invention, or natural ability. We created tanks, perfected the aeroplane engine, and in all anti-submarine devices necessity proved with us a very fertile mother of invention: our bombs were quite as destructive, and our gas as poisonous, as those of any rival. But once the strain was relaxed, we fell back into old ways, and

the history of iron and steel, cotton and coal since the War have not been examples of the application of knowledge to a situation the facts of which were perfectly ascertainable. Nor are we yet quite holding our own. We hear much talk of British enterprise, British initiative, British vigour: I wish that we heard more reference to that which is needed, first and foremost, in the modern world, if we are to keep our place in it, British knowledge. I have a letter by me, written by a friend much concerned with overseas trade and the commerce of the empire, in which ominous reference is made to "the dreadful toll that lack of knowledge exacts from the ordinary Englishman who goes abroad to push his fortunes." The schools must take a large portion of the blame. Every one knows the young English schoolboy who has been a good captain in his House, and perhaps played for the Eleven or Fifteen, but whose intellectual achievement has not soared above the acquisition of a School Certificate. That would not matter, since in himself the boy is excellent material, if he had ever been taught to respect knowledge, to know the paramount necessity of having knowledge, if he had ever, indeed, been taught to know what knowledge is. But he has not been taught, and he goes out into the rivalries of the modern commercial world as a sheep to the slaughter, so that in plantation, estate, and farm, and the commerce which is built upon them, we are failing as compared with men of other races,

with Dutchmen and Americans, with Frenchmen and Germans and Japanese. Or let us take another and a smaller instance. Agriculture and production in the Dominions, and particularly in the tropical dependencies, require the services of many trained biologists, botanists, and zoologists, but they are not to be had. Their work is to apply modern scientific knowledge to the production and protection of crops, and it offers a career of great utility to the community, and some profit. There is no one who is directing the nation's education to meet the nation's needs in such directions: we wait always till the gap is there, and the want is felt, and trust to the slow operation of the laws of supply and demand. Meantime wrong crops may continue to be planted, and removable pests play havoc. There would again appear to be somewhere a lack of the sense of the value of knowledge.

We need in this age the scientific expert, the man who knows, in every branch of activity, and we need to have it driven into the inner consciousness of everybody that to such a person we must in all cases first turn, that knowledge is always to be sought and had, and knowledge used. We need the employer who has imagination, not the man who thinks that the services of an expert can always be bought for a pittance, if you happen to need him, but the man who realizes that every business to-day, if it is to be great, requires its General Staff of experts, men possessed of knowledge and capable of research,

and that success will go to those who follow the paths which these indicate, and not to those who follow tradition, and ascribe their decreasing returns to every cause save their own failure to appreciate the uses of knowledge. We need also workmen with the same zeal to know, opportunities for them to learn, and to rise by learning. It may be said that there are such industries, and that is true. But these are not the industries which are failing. Until the schools can teach all classes that knowledge counts, that knowledge is indispensable to our country, and until the lesson of the successful permeates all industries, so long will our country continue to wallow in the trough of industrial depression. It is no utilitarian view of education which I am advocating, unless it be utilitarian to argue that education must prepare a nation for the life which it must live. The greatness of England, all its opportunity for service in the world, all the contribution which it may make towards lifting humanity to a higher level, depends upon its power of producing wealth, and then upon its ability to use it. The same is true of the United States. It is true of many countries. What matters most, is that it is true of us. It is not a low view; it is far better than that dream of military domination on which Napoleon wrecked the fortunes of France for generations, and the military caste of Germany wrecked the prosperity of their nation, when the world was all before it. It is far better than that dream

in which the youth of Britain is supposed at times to have been brought up, that the Empire means that we should colour the largest possible portion of the earth's surface red, for so it is well-pleasing to a Providence which has the good taste to distinguish between race and race. It teaches that it is the business of our nation to supply human needs, and to improve the conditions of life, that it is the business of our education to produce for the service of their country an increasing number of intelligent men to work for those ends. The production of wealth may be taken as an index of efficiency, but that does not prove that the spirit of the nation, or of the education, which gives it inspiration, is utilitarian, or sordid.

It is sometimes said that education can never make any man better. This is only true if education be taken in that narrow sense, in which it is not infrequently used, which applies it only to the training of the intellect. But it is not true of education as it has been understood in the great English traditions, and as I have attempted to set it forth in this book: to the scrupulous training of intellectual ability is added the production of character as the ultimate end, which will alone give value to the whole. There are, I think, three great results which will follow from this education, where it has been really successful. The first is, the capacity to see a thing as it really is, a capacity which is as yet none too common: the second is the resolve to

do whatever has to be done as well as it possibly can be done, and this is a commoner result of our present education, though it is often unenlightened: the third is to live life by right values, by seeking truth because there is such a thing as knowledge, and by seeking goodness because there is such a thing as virtue. If such an education could be made a reality in all our schools in that vision of the future which I have before my eyes, while I admit with sadness that none of the schools can as yet claim with justice that they produce those results for even a majority of their pupils, what differences would it not make in our public and political life? It would destroy the power of the mob-orator and the cheap journalist; elections would bring us a less galling sense of shame, and crime and sex would cease to be thought the only subjects of general popular interest. In our social life it would mean less gambling and betting, less drinking, less waste of time on poor and sometimes degrading amusements. In our private life it would mean better houses, and cleaner houses, less meanness and slander, and less of the Divorce Court. In all classes of society there would be fewer cads and more gentlemen in the sense that the gentleman is he who accepts his position, and strives to fulfil all its responsibilities, and the cad is he who usurps every privilege which he can seize, and dishonours every obligation that he can avoid.

It is no political creed that I advocate, nor

have I written to support the programme of Conservatism, or of Liberalism, or of Labour. The road to the future may be cleared here and there by Acts of Parliament, but Acts of Parliament alone will not induce the nation to march whither the future leads and beckons. It is a proposal that we should make our country better by making ourselves better, the only way known to me by which it can be done, and we have in our hands in the noble ideal of the English tradition of education the instrument by which, if it should be the will of God that this nation should serve humanity, the work can be accomplished.

CHAPTER XVII

WHAT ARE THE PROSPECTS?

I HAVE endeavoured in the preceding pages to set forth the ideal as it shapes itself in my mind, but I am aware that there may be those who think that the development of human society which is close upon us, which has indeed begun, and which is moving rapidly, will not be upon these lines, will condemn it in theory, and prevent it in practice. It would seem reasonable, therefore, to give grounds for the faith that is in me by attempting to survey the broad sweep and current of the political tide on which humanity is now afloat: no less a metaphor would convey the power and the universality of the influences which are carrying men forward to changes which are as inevitable as they are often unrealized at the moment when they occur. I have written this book in the belief that universal education and unrestricted democracy go together, and that neither can in their true and best sense exist without the other. Already democracy, though imperfectly realized, has given to the most advanced communities of the world the conception of education for all, and has within a century brought into being partial approximations to

that ideal: it will be a hard set-back if the next scene in the play should show democracy as obsolete and unworkable, an unserviceable theory of government discarded by humanity and cast aside on the line of its march.

The case against democracy is strong and can be stated so as to seem at first sight overwhelming. Representation, it is said, is a delusion. The citizens who could sit in assembly as at Athens, listen to the speeches of their leaders, and decide the issue by their immediate votes were the only true democrats whom the world has seen: their career was vigorous and splendid, but it was short and bloody. The citizen of Great Britain who at uncertain but long intervals exercises one twenty-millionth part of the voting power of the community on an indefinite and general issue is merely the victim of a sham. He exercises no real power, and is just raw material to be shaped by those who control the machines of politics, and decide the issues. Politicians are those who seek power, position, or money, for themselves, and success goes to those who promise most: they are out for the "spoils," and inevitably in days of peace and settled conditions develop into "ins" and "outs," divided by no real principle, and caring nothing for the public interest. They purchase votes not by the bribery of the individual but by the bribery of whole classes. Democracies are therefore always predatory by instinct, and the community which is so governed is always first divided against itself, and then ruined. In such a State only

mediocrity can survive and flourish, and ultimate poverty is certain.

Moreover, Parliaments are everywhere discredited, since it is said that they are of themselves only useful for harm; save in the way of corrupting the community, and robbing its best elements, they do nothing real. They only appear to do things. The complexity of the modern State is such that all legislation must be the work of experts, and the task of preparing and shaping policy in social, economic, and international spheres must be undertaken by those who know. The nominees of the popular vote do not know, and only appear to judge: in reality they obey the Party Whips, and vote for or against measures which are shaped and decided upon elsewhere. The whole system is therefore a sham, and power does not reside where it seems to reside. For this reason, in a clear-sighted nation like the Italians, which is fortunate in having a great leader, who sees the modern welter of politics "steadily, and sees it whole," we have witnessed the reduction of Parliament to the status of a registry: we have observed similar developments elsewhere, nor will it be long before France, so we are told in some quarters, will, with its luminous sense of reality, follow the same example, and discard its discredited professional politicians, and the humbug of the marionette-democracy whose strings they work. Or again, if you look to a totally different experiment, the new departure which Russian Bolshevism has presented to an

astonished world, again you see no attempt made to preserve the unreality of Parliament. A close oligarchy, commanding the services of such experts as in this case it has not executed, imposes its will on the whole community, and in a sense never intended or visualized by Rousseau, all men are forced to be free. If Lenin and Mussolini are the pioneers of the advances of humanity, we must certainly regard democracy and Parliamentary government as already left behind upon the road.

Such is the case which now in this form and now in that is in these days constantly presented. It is very easy to make hasty generalizations, but it is dangerous to borrow our analogies from abroad. Just as I have endeavoured to show that in our education with all its imperfections we have developed something of special value for our needs which has its roots in the distant past, and has grown with and from our national life, so in our politics we have suffered no violent break with what has gone before, and not even the stresses of the War broke down the tradition of sound political common sense which has been through the ages to our good fortune a marked national characteristic, and which has the power of making things work. There is nothing wrong with Parliament save that we are expecting it to work in the twentieth century in just the same way as it worked immediately after the Reform Act, and there is nothing wrong with democracy save that we will insist on thinking of it in terms of voting power with a mental picture of the nimble-

witted Athenian listening to Demosthenes in the Agora all the time at the back of our minds: we will not realize that voting is not the most important function of the modern citizen. The conditions of human life have become very complex, the range of public questions has become very wide, questions that were local in their scope are now national, and frequently international, knowledge both wide and deep is demanded for the handling of many problems, and for these reasons the whole machinery of government is becoming more complex also, and we are merely in a state of transition to the more complex democracy which will be naturally suited to the new conditions, and we are at the present time somewhat confused in the transition from the past to the future.

It is quite true that there are many questions to-day which are too difficult for those who have not devoted to them long and special study, and at times there are decisions to be taken after a review of such copious and conflicting detail that debate in a large assembly would prove as interminable as it would be confusing; the final course must be fixed by those few who are most responsible. Because the War was only won when we had a single generalissimo for the whole of the Allied Forces, and because the Peace Conference only began to move and make progress when the Big Four got together, we assume that large assemblies are of no real use, but we forget that the conditions of 1918 and 1919 are happily very rare,

and may never recur again, and we ignore the vast amount of staff work and information derived from co-operative effort which was at the disposal of Marshal Foch, and the leading personalities of the Peace Conference. There are more striking instances than this, as Mr. Zimmern has pointed out in his essay on the "Prospects of Democracy." Four men, each representing the national bank of the great countries of France, Germany, England, and the United States, met privately in New York, and came to decisions which vitally affected the economic rehabilitation of the world. They were none of them responsible statesmen in the ordinary political sense: they represented no political constituency, and rendered account to no body of voters. Yet they were officials with expert knowledge of their province which the democratic life of great communities had produced by natural development, and they were there to be used when needed. Similarly, the Dawes plan was again the work of private individuals. As Mr. Zimmern says: "A body of private persons makes a report on a problem which has been tormenting the public life of Europe for half a decade. The report is drawn up with so much knowledge and judgment, it is so admirably adapted to the needs of the time, that it is accepted *en bloc* by the governments and peoples concerned and has become one of the main elements in the international political system of the years through which we are passing. Yet the men who drew it up were not finance ministers or departmental officials. They were private individ-

uals, chosen just because they had a breadth of outlook, a detachment, and perhaps also a range of knowledge, not commonly found in governmental circles." But again the point to be seized is that these individuals, men of the requisite quality, had been quite naturally produced by the ordinary life of the communities to which they belonged, and all this special knowledge is present for the democratic communities of the future to organize and to use without carrying on the pretence that everything is thought out and arrived at by the collective wisdom of the elected representatives of the nation.

In the democracies of the future, which are based upon the Anglo-Saxon tradition, the great democracy of the United States, and all those which are grouped together as the British Commonwealth of Nations, it is not unreasonable to suppose that the common citizen will retain his vote, and use it from time to time with effect. That vote will be more important as a veto than as an affirmation: it will enable ordinary men and women to lay down that certain courses shall not be followed or attempted rather than to command that certain things shall be done. It is no bad thing, indeed it is essential, that the policies of experts should be brought at intervals to the bar of popular opinion: there is ever a great danger that the specialist may become divorced from common life, and contemptuous of ordinary individuals. But, as has been said already, the citizen will not make himself effective only at long intervals in exercis-

ing the franchise. He will have his political associations in which the weather-wise will be able to detect the feeling of the country. He will have his professional and occupational associations, in which will be stored up the expert particular knowledge which the community can use, when the need arises. Discussion and authorship, books and the newspapers, are open to him if he wishes to exert influence. All that need be demanded, and all that can be exacted, from the citizen of the future is that he should take an intelligent interest in politics and all public questions, and devote himself to his own special profession or occupation within the commonwealth. In saying that this is all I am well aware that this is more than we are getting at present, for the average members of the nation are not as yet educated well enough to be able to give it. But I shall be much mistaken in my estimate if my forecast of the future does not bring out the need in every direction for more and for better education. The citizen body that the future of democracy demands, if democracy is to succeed, must be one which has enjoyed an education which, however diverse in subject-matter, is similar in ideals, since this alone can create the nation which is energetic, intelligent, and homogeneous.

It is a common observation nowadays that the prestige of membership of the House of Commons has sadly fallen. People used to look up to those who could write M.P. after their names, for rightly or wrongly they regarded them as the legislators

and the real rulers of the nation. But in part the central committees have been too careless as to the character and mental equipment of the candidates whom they have sometimes forced upon the constituencies, for it is a bad thing for democracy when the average elector feels that he is certainly more intelligent, and perhaps more virtuous, than the member for whom, unless he is prepared to desert his party, he is forced to vote. A more important reason for the decline in prestige is the growing realization that the work of government is not done on the floor of the House of Commons, but in committee-rooms, and still more in Government offices, with the result that the newspapers, the infallible register of the amount of public interest, have reduced their reports of Parliamentary proceedings in most cases to a negligible minimum. There ought to be a far clearer recognition than there is that the work of Parliament is very real and arduous, and demands, if it is to be properly fulfilled, certain not too common qualities and attainments. The member of Parliament ought to be a man of sound practical judgment, able to understand a case, to weigh evidence, and to come to a decision, in other words, a trained committee-man. He should be a man of high principle, for professional politics can so easily become a dirty game, and can soil the best. He should be a man with powers of clear exposition who can explain a case, or set forth a subject, in clear terms to a mixed gathering, for not the least of his functions should be the education of his own

electorate. It would be understood that he and his peers sitting together formed the grand inquest or standing committee of the nation, and such qualifications, if generally possessed, could not but raise the whole prestige of Parliament. Again, at every point, it is a question not only of the possession of considerable natural ability, but of a high degree of education: not only knowledge but character is involved. In the true democratic State that high degree of education must be attainable by every member of the community, of whatever social class, who has the ability to rise to it.

Behind this grand committee of the nation there must be, as there is now, a trained Civil Service, groups of experts who have devoted their lives to the study of one aspect of the multiform national life. It is idle to cry aloud at the multiplication of Government Offices: they are the inevitable outcome of the increasing complexity and growing scale of the national life which Governments must direct. Without them the House of Commons must long ago have broken down through lack of knowledge and time, and sheer inability to do the work. It is needless to point out that the members of this Civil Service must continue to be, as they now are, men of high intellectual quality and of thorough education, and that the character for impartiality and absolute integrity, for which they stand unrivalled in the world, must be sustained. Here, again, it is education which lies at the basis, education broadly conceived, as it has

been in this book, as developing and shaping the whole nature of man, and laying its emphasis on character before intellect, yet neglecting neither. But the rulers of the future must be able to gather resources from fields wider than the covenanted Civil Service. All men ought to be organized according to their professions and occupations, as spontaneously, indeed, but irregularly and incompletely, they are organizing themselves now. These associations should remain free, and membership should remain voluntary. But the Government should definitely be able to call on the executive of each such professional or occupational association for whatever assistance it requires, for the production of information, and the nomination of experts. In this way the democratic State would command the service of the best knowledge in any direction, now in banking, and now in mining, now in applied chemistry, now in architecture and town-planning, and so on through all the range of human activities. Each one of these associations would be a democracy *in petto*, with an executive responsible to the ordinary members, and carrying out policies which at any time could be reversed by their votes. Every citizen would be able, if he wished, to live his life, on one side of it, in full activity as a member of such an association, whether he were a bricklayer or an astronomer, and through this life would be able to fit himself for the rendering of important public service, whether it were as the secretary of a trade-union, or as a recognized

expert in some branch of specialized knowledge. Democracy would therefore manifest itself in the future as a multi-cellular organization, in which each cell had a life of its own, and each contributed by proper functioning to the well-being of the whole: but all would be subservient to the sovereign power of the Parliament, and would in no wise take its place. Such an organization would not be unnatural, for it has been for long growing up of itself: but since it has been left to grow up by itself, and no one has had any clear idea of its proper functioning, there are still parts of the field where no organization exists, though it ought to exist, and other parts of the field where more than one association covers the ground in weakness and rivalry. Some have recognized status, and some have none: some have a full and representative membership, and some are very weak. All ought to be organized so as to function in free activity both for their own good and for the service of the State, and all ought to be based on the exercise of the franchise by the individual member.

The dictatorships which are now the fashion in certain quarters of that European world which was supposed to have been made safe for democracy, are in my opinion temporary expedients, and represent probably the best that can be done in the particular circumstances. They occur mainly where the racial stock belongs wholly to the Latin tradition, where Parliaments have been a new growth, a device imposed from without, and not native to the life of the people. There has been

no age-long habit of settling common affairs in representative councils such as have become a second nature to the Anglo-Saxon stock. In these countries the political representatives have been men whose characters as a whole have earned little respect, adroit and clever at best, at worst venal and corrupt, and the worst has been frequently in evidence. The best elements of these societies have left politics severely alone. Moreover, in the general mass of the inhabitants of these countries the rate of illiteracy has been high. It has therefore, as in Italy, seemed the obvious policy to sweep away the sham of Parliamentary government which has had no roots in the soil, and to substitute for it the realities, dividing the citizen body according to function. It is an interesting experiment, this expedient of a dictator commanding a skilled civil service and ruling by force for the common good, and it is not wholly unlike the form of government which in the past endured for some centuries in these regions, with Mussolini playing the part of Divus Cæsar. But that old system perished from the *malaise* which it produced, it gradually drained its subjects of life and energy: it is a system in which there is no life welling up from below. It is unhealthy, and under modern conditions unstable, liable to strain and stress: and, like the Principate of Rome, the Principate of Mussolini will suffer from the same weakness, the inability to nominate an accepted successor. But, as a system, it is wholly inapplicable to the region of Anglo-Saxon democracy in the

old world or the new, where the level of education is comparatively high, and where the habits of freedom of thought, freedom of speech, and the exercise of the vote are in the fibre of the people. It is altogether on a lower level, for the Anglo-Saxon system offers to all its individual members the opportunity of becoming with increasing reality both sovereign and subject in the State of the future. On the other system they can only be for all time subjects to an external sovereign. No State can be healthy where the bulk of the population is in a condition of permanent subjection, and which presents only a hard dichotomy of the governors and the governed. Such a rule gathers rich harvests to-day, but none to-morrow.

It is perhaps hardly worth while to turn aside to contemplate for a moment the system of Soviet Russia, that vast, backward, and illiterate community gripped by a doctrinaire oligarchy which controls such nerve-centres as exist in the undeveloped mass. An autocracy ruling by a police system, an aristocracy which had no duties, and a small middle class that had no political life, have been swept away, and given place to the inverted Czardom of the Soviets, while the vast mass of the people continues to be wholly interested in and bound up with the land. Not only the capitalist system has been rejected, but the error has been made that the only realities are economic, and a complete sunderance has been made from that tradition of European civilization which has its threefold roots in Greece, Rome, and Palestine.

Russia lies on the flank of a recovering world, a great enigma. Its obvious sufferings of body and soul discourage imitation, and indeed it offers to all classes of Western democracy no more than the victory of a barren formula in return for the sacrifice of most that they have achieved and most that they hold dear. The seed which it has sown in blood and nurtured with tears may in the long process of beneficent time grow into a worthy harvest, and Russia become a mighty partner in the world-commonwealth of the future. But for the present it treads the path of solitude, and teaches no lessons which the leading nations can learn.

This rapid and imperfect review is merely intended to suggest in broad outline the reasons for the conclusion that neither Lenin nor Mussolini has opened up the road to the true political organization which will reflect the manifold human life of the nations of the future, and that the main line of advance will be found in the democracies of Germany and France, Great Britain and the United States. Germany and France will make each their individual contribution in freedom and goodwill, if only evil memories and the spectre of fear can be finally banished from that frontier-line which they so obstinately haunt. The future organization will shape itself somewhat differently in those races to which English is the native tongue, and English institutions the traditional inheritance. It will have been obvious in the whole consideration of the topic as it has been developed

that at every stage true success will depend upon the reality of the education attained. It is not only that the voter must be intelligent enough to decide between policies, to understand their exposition, and to appreciate their reaction upon circles far wider than those with which he is in immediate contact: he must be of such a character that cheap demagogy will cease to be profitable as an instrument for those to use who would win his confidence. He must have an instinct for co-operation, and see the whole world as a great co-operative society. He must co-operate with the fellow-members of his profession or occupation, and see that association as one among many, all working together to build up the manifold life of the State. He must co-operate with the fellow-members of his political party, and see his nation as one among many all helping to build up the manifold life of the world. He must therefore have the ability to understand, and give weight to, the other side in any question, and at times have the poise and political sense which enables him to leave a question open and undecided: both these qualities are the fruit of education, and of education only, and neither is as yet by any means common. He must be prepared to accept the view of the expert, in matters which he does not know, and cannot know, and to give the view of an expert, impartially and according to truth, in matters where he has the knowledge, and is called upon to impart it. Again this can be so only in a society in which education is so generally diffused

that respect for truth is instinctive, and most men are aware, as they are far from being aware at present, that things are what they are, and not what we would like them to be, that it is not a world in which in any circumstances fourpence can ever be ninepence, or anything durable ever be achieved without hard work and sacrifice.

It will, however, as I conceive it, not be a society which will be wholly under the dominion of the expert, where knowledge will be so specialized that its individual professors remain uneducated as men and citizens, although they know everything that is to be known within their narrow range. I would rely upon two forces to save the position. The one would be in the nature of the education which all would receive which would be broad enough to present culture as a whole as the natural province for all, the desirability of knowing something about most things, of having more kingdoms than one into which there is privilege of entry. The other would be the fact that at all stages the final reference would be to the popular franchise, that policies would have to be justified to the ordinary members of any association, that the expert must ever be ready and able to explain himself to the layman, just as in the sphere of the nation's politics statesmen would have to submit themselves to the arbitrament of the popular will. In small things or in great every one would have a chance of governing, just as every one would be governed.

But this society must break down unless on the

top of intellectual training there is in the nation a common ideal of character, and a common ideal. If this is not the case, one or other party must impose its will on the remainder: the few must rule the many by relentless exercise of will, or the many must bring themselves to destruction and ruin. Of the former alternative we have already examples in the world: it is wholly a question of education whether the great democracies of the West shall rise to the level at which all live consciously both for themselves and for others in successful co-operation, or sink to that other alternative which will mark the failure of the fairest hope of the human race.

CHAPTER XVIII

WHAT ARE THE PROSPECTS? (*contd.*)

IT may be thought that I have written of the democracies of the future without any realization of the hard facts of the present international position, and as if no such thing as war on the great scale could ever again disturb the harmony of the earth. I have, however, thought it better to keep the consideration of this group of problems for a separate chapter, but whenever in preceding pages I have stressed the importance of inculcating through our education the will to co-operate with others, and to serve the society of which we are members, I have continually had in mind the truth that it is only by the dominance of character such as this in the direction of the affairs of men that civilization can be saved. The danger of the present time is that men are too ready to let things drift, for the present generations have been caught up once in the tides of events which no man could control, and the belief that things will be as they will be is all too common. Many, moreover, are too old to learn. The young, on the other hand, have not seen, they have only heard. It is plain that education has a great task here, a

task that requires infinite patience, and is as wide as the world.

The whole of our civilization lies under a dark shadow, and there are pessimists who see the faces of our young children wrapped in the shadows of a dreadful fate. The danger is not unapprehended, or indefinite, for the grim facts stare the peoples in the face. I quote an eloquent description from Mr. Winston Churchill's last book, *The World Crisis: the Aftermath*, which does not exaggerate the plain truth. "Certain sombre facts emerge solid, inexorable, like the shapes of mountains from drifting mist. It is established that henceforward whole populations will take part in war, all doing their utmost, all subjected to the fury of the enemy. It is established that nations who believe their life is at stake will not be restrained from using any means to secure their existence. It is probable—nay certain—that among the means which will next time be at their disposal will be agencies and processes of destruction wholesale, unlimited, and perhaps, once launched, uncontrollable.

"Mankind has never been in this position before. Without having improved appreciably in virtue or enjoying wiser guidance, it has got into its hands for the first time the tools by which it can unfailingly accomplish its own extermination. That is the point in human destinies to which all the glories and toils of men have at last led them. They would do well to pause and ponder upon their new responsibilities. Death

stands at attention, obedient, expectant, ready to serve, ready to shear away the peoples *en masse*: ready, if called on, to pulverize, without hope of repair, what is left of civilization. He awaits only the word of command. He awaits it from a frail, bewildered being, long his victim, now—for one occasion only—his Master."

We can picture humanity to be like the inhabitants of some village in the mountains, cultivating ground which yields the fruits of the earth in fair abundance, but ever and again is swept by landslides, which grow more and more destructive: and after one such catastrophe, which has swept away half the village, there come forward some who say, "Why should we not move to the neighbouring upland, where the landslides never come: the aspect is more favourable, the soil more rich? We only need the act of faith to pack up, and go, and trust the future." But others answer, "There have always been landslides in our village, and there always will be landslides: it is no use to cry out against fate. Besides, we know what we have got here, and we do not know whether we should keep it there: there would be redivision and a new set of rules." It is an even chance, at best, whether the inhabitants of that village would move or not: perhaps it is most likely that they would stay and await the final landslide. And I suppose that it is not more than an even chance that the world will finally discard collective war as a possible instrument of policy.

It is only by education that it can be lifted to the higher levels, and the human race move to the uplands. The will to peace can only be based on the instinct of co-operation, and the instinct of co-operation must be fostered and trained in all our schools, and inspire all our training. The lead to the world must be given by the British Commonwealth and the United States, for these alone have known how to group large masses of population and great stretches of territory in peace, and have banished from their consciousness the shadow of the danger of war. They have numbers, power, and wealth, and the methods which they have followed by conscious design, or by happy accident, cannot but offer some enlightenment as to the road which the whole world can most happily follow.

The British Empire, that whole group of diverse peoples that are united only by a symbol, allegiance to the Crown, is not only a form of association which the world has never yet seen, but is something which exists in fact, and not in theory, which has grown, and has not been manufactured. Just because of its diversity and its flexibility it is full of suggestion to those who speculate as to the future organization of the world. Its present constitution has been defined by the Resolutions of the Imperial Conference of 1926 : its members are said to be " autonomous Communities within the British Empire, equal in status, in no way subordinate one to another in any aspect of their domestic or external affairs,

though united by a common allegiance to the Crown and freely associated as members of the British Commonwealth of Nations." Among these Great Britain is one like the rest, no more than *primus inter pares*. What is thus laid down in theory, is not yet true in practice: it is as yet true only of some in some respects, and not in others. But that does not matter. It is the status towards which the whole group is growing up, the linked ends of self-determination and co-operation. The group contains within itself advanced communities like the great self-governing Dominions, Canada, Australia, South Africa, New Zealand, the vast mass of peoples held together in India by the British Raj, moving restlessly and incessantly by obscure and uneasy paths towards the institutions which will give them self-respect and mutual respect, if haply they can be found, the backward races of Africa who have hardly emerged from childhood, but to-morrow or the day after will be adolescent, and troubled, the islands and small territories dotted over the whole face of the habitable globe. All these are moving towards freedom in association, all alike are profoundly interested in the preservation of peace, all have discarded the thought of war as a possible event occurring between themselves. They are united by a symbol, the Crown, which means nothing, and which means everything. They have no instrument of government, no means of expressing a common will save a conference which meets once in every

four years. They constitute an Empire which the logical realist would regard as a sham, and which its enemies have repeatedly represented as one more supreme instance of the hypocrisy of the English, who put forward pretences as reality: yet it was a band strong enough for all its members to be willing to offer themselves in battle for the common cause. It is divided by racial divisions, economic rivalries, irreconcilable interests, but it preserves peace, and as a whole it works. Can the world itself show greater variety, and is there any reason why the whole world should not come to be bound together by similar ties, which, while in some few respects they are as strong as steel, in most are as intangible as gossamer? Things move very rapidly. It was but the other day that we were habitually speaking and thinking of the colonies of the British Empire, and asking whether Great Britain would keep her colonies. Within a generation all the elements of the picture have shaken themselves into a new grouping. As education spreads far and wide, may not the whole world regroup itself almost as quickly?

The United States of America have a contribution to make to the future welfare of the world as great as, or greater than, that of any nation. They are the largest mass of the human race that has ever been gathered under a single form of democratic government, and it is not a bold prophecy to add that they are the largest

that ever will be so ruled. They command increasingly the wealth of the world: they inhabit a vast territory which is immune from attack, and possesses resources which are almost inexhaustible: they can exert in any direction immense power, and they have already once played a decisive part in the drama of the world's history. They can, if they wish, outbuild any fleet, and outnumber any army. They have a great decision to make. They may be tempted to enter upon the path of self-assertion, to impose their will by force upon the world, and to rely upon the maxim that "they shall take who have the power, and they shall keep who can." They may prefer to shut themselves up within their own ample boundaries, enjoying their own good things, and to let the rest of the world work out its own salvation or ruin, taking no part in promoting the one or the other. Or they may come forward as one of the world's great leaders, enforcing peace, and teaching co-operation, in full partnership and making no reservation. This last course is alone worthy of the greatest democracy of the world. The British Commonwealth of Nations stands ready to be an ally. Underlying the English-speaking peoples of every strain there can be the same education, so that we shall speak not only the same tongue, but in terms of the same ideals. The more the educators of both countries can mix, the more contacts they can make, the more they can share their practice and their theory, the more

hopeful will the future be: for so much the more certainly will the peoples answer to the same call, and so much the more easily will they work together in mutual understanding.

That mutual understanding is the firmest ground on which we have to walk at the present moment, but the Great War, in which many fought bravely in the hope that it might be the last, left behind it in the League of Nations an organization new to the world, a weakling, disowned almost at birth by its chief sponsor, about which old-fashioned wiseacres have been shaking their heads ever since, and saying that it cannot survive. It has suffered alike from the malicious depreciation of its enemies, and from the excessive enthusiasms of its friends. It has been expected to function from the start as a kind of super-State, and some have been glad, and more have been sorry, that it has conspicuously failed to do so. It has two functions, one positive, and one negative, and it is probable that when its history comes to be written it will be found that the value of its positive contribution greatly outweighs what it has accomplished on the negative side. Its negative function is to prevent war, and here it offers in reality only the deterrent of publicity, and the machinery of delay. These are by no means to be underrated, for either of them, if fully operative in 1914, would have prevented the great catastrophe which overtook the world. In that better-educated world which is not only possible, but probable, in the future,

when what is done anywhere is known everywhere, and known at once, publicity may well prove the strongest deterrent of all: it will be no light thing to stand at the bar of the world's opinion. The positive function of the League is being wrought out and developed month by month at Geneva, and here the League of Nations is doing no less than steadily developing the organs necessary for international co-operation. The more the nations do together, the more they can do together. This is not the place in which to enter upon a detailed exposition of the various activities which are concentrated at Geneva: they can be found in various books of reference, and in the publications of the League of Nations Union. But it will be found that the Commissions of the League to a great extent represent the various departments of government already familiar to us within national limits, but so extended as to have international reference. Finance, trade, education, transit, health, labour, all offer problems which can only be solved by international co-operation, outside and beyond all those topics which have been the proper subject-matter of diplomacy hitherto, and the League of Nations is providing the means by which the international solution of these problems can be attempted. It is, moreover, bringing to the work not only the trained civil servants, but it is also drawing on the great reservoirs of expert knowledge which exist in all the great civilized communities of Europe and America.

It is bridging the gap which has formed, and been too long allowed to continue, between the world of government and administration, and the world of production and commerce, between those who direct and administer, and those who do and make. It is steadily teaching the world that business men are public servants, and with the steady growth throughout the world of production on the large scale, with the coming dominance of what may be called mass-economics, it is essential for the well-being of humanity that the great business men and captains of industry should more and more envisage themselves as the servants of the commonwealth, as indeed they are, servants not of themselves, nor of one nation only. Bankers and economists, leaders of manufacture and leaders of labour, social workers and specialists, all have services to render which are not only national but international, and the League of Nations is showing not only that this is so, but how it is to be done.

The ordinary man is impatient. He thinks of Geneva as a talking-shop where nothing real is done, the paradise of doctrinaire committee-men. He thinks it is a place which ought to be able to keep Mussolini in order, and cannot. He does not realize that world-co-operation cannot but be a plant of extremely slow growth, that it cannot become a strong influence until it has become a habit, and the formation of habits takes time. The League of Nations is the habit of co-operation, and its strength at any moment

is exactly the extent to which that habit has been formed. It has to create a state of mind. Let us take an example, not infrequently quoted. There runs between Canada and the United States an artificial frontier four thousand miles in length, which carries not a single fortress, not a single gun of position. That can be so, and is perfectly natural, because there exists on each side of that frontier the state of mind which makes such precautions absolutely unnecessary. The problem of world peace is to create on other frontiers the same state of mind, no more and no less, and that which prevents it from coming into existence is fear. Fear can only be eradicated by the feeling of security, and that feeling of security can only come from the formation of habits of doing things together in friendship and of growing to rely upon another. The frontier of the Rhine is soaked in blood, and twice within living memory an armed nation has crossed it to lay waste and to slay: it is haunted by innumerable ghosts, and dread hovers always over its fields. With these memories seared into the living flesh it is impossible that France should trust at once to paper obligations and hypothetical promises: it dreads the coming of that third occasion when their secular enemy may be able to take them by the throat, and alone. It is therefore unreasonable to expect a rapid disarmament: it can be no quicker than the growth of that international co-operation which is steadily, but slowly, being fostered. The one must increase, the other

must decrease. We cannot unduly hurry the process. We cannot forget, for instance, that in 1918 Turkey was disarmed, suppliant, and helpless, and that in 1922 it was able to return, red with the blood of Christian populations, massacred with complete impunity, to much of its former pride of place, largely because we had thrown away our power, and could not say them Nay. A righteous man, if he lives in a community of knaves, cannot be as righteous, if he is to survive at all, as he would be in more congenial surroundings, and, so long as there are armed burglars about, it is advisable to keep a pistol in the house. But while this is a reason for exercising prudence and precaution, it is no reason for despairing of the ultimate conversion of the burglars.

There is, however, happily more solid ground for a sober optimism than the mere expectation that things will improve as time goes by, and that another generation will arise without those prepossessions of ours which so continually prevent us from thinking on new lines. There are two very real achievements to which we can already look back with satisfaction, and from which we can look forward with hope. The Treaty of Locarno, by which Great Britain, France, Germany, and Italy solemnly agreed together that they would not in any circumstances resort to war, and would unite to offer common resistance to any one of their number which broke the bond, is one such achievement, and it deserves the description given to it by Mr. Churchill, that

it is "the greatest measure of self-preservation yet taken by Europeans." It bears date from October, 1925, and some four years earlier the United States, Great Britain, and Japan had signed together the Treaty of Washington, assuring the peace of the Pacific, which many had thought to be likely to become the next storm-centre of the world. Thus are driven down to the solid rock two great piers of the bridge which will carry the human race over the flood of fear and aggression to the land of security and assured peace. If as yet they stand isolated, we have seen in what manner the building may succeed, and we can continue patient construction after the same plan.

After all, if Great Britain and the United States, France and Germany, Italy and Japan say that there shall be no more war, war will certainly not happen on the great scale. To make war in the grand manner, to which we were so disastrously made accustomed, is possible only to nations which possess an advanced industrial system, highly developed communications, and great reserves of capital or credit, and if armament makers are kept well under control, even the more backward and pugnacious peoples will find it hard to indulge their national instincts. The problem is very limited in scope, and the worst feature of the present position is the danger that the nations may settle down without fully meaning it to a system of competitive armaments. Therefore the question of

disarmament must never be allowed to rest, or the machine will again become our master. For whatever we build, is obsolescent, when built: with whatever weapons we are armed, there are always better coming upon the market, and powerful interests to push them. And it is obvious that armaments can be of no use save for purposes of police, if we mean what we say, if indeed we all mean what we already have said. But the trouble is that we do not quite know whether we mean what we say, and we only wish that we did.

In this position, what is the task of the educator, and what can be done for the cause of international peace in the schools? One of the demands that is frequently made, and continuously pressed, is that the history books should be rewritten. There is much to be said for this plea, if it is meant that our English history books are too frequently written as if Europe and the rest of the world did not exist. "Saxon and Normans and Dane are we," but none of them has any existence or origin until they appear within the shores of this historically tight little island: France, for instance, is a country in which our kings conduct adventurous campaigns, in which the victories are stressed and the defeats slurred over: the Empire and the Papacy are names. But the plea usually means much more than this. It represents a view that history in schools has been too much of the "drum and trumpet" variety, and that it has set itself to

the glorification of war: it exalts the general and the admiral, and neglects the saint, the philosopher, and the humanitarian. There may be some truth in this criticism too, though the critics are usually middle-aged or old men and women, and not themselves teachers: they generalize from the textbooks of their youth. And usually they go too far. It is possible, usual, and sensible to show war for what it is, brutal and beastly, and yet to give due honour to the shining virtues which it calls forth. It is right to be proud of the bowmen of Crécy, the sailors who fought the Armada, the squares that stood fast at Waterloo, the incomparable infantry of the Somme. "*Dulce et decorum est pro patria mori*" is an old motto, and a true one, not to be neglected by those who would teach the duty of service and the lesson of co-operation. The task of the coming generation is to sublimate the virtues which their ancestors showed on ruder and more terrible fields, not to belittle them nor to ignore them, and it will not be an easy task. For the love of ease and the love of self stand ever ready to corrupt the blessings of peace, and it can do no harm, but only good, for every boy to feel that he comes of a stock whose men were brave and unflinching in the presence of death. But objection lies deeper against this whole project of rewriting history with a purpose, however excellent that purpose may be. Every scholar and every honest teacher revolts against teaching history with a deliberate bias, selecting and omitting and representing or

misrepresenting. The ideals of the League of Nations can never prevail in this way: they must be based on the truth, on the facts of past history unedited.

But there is no need to edit the facts. They tell their own tale. To make converts to the cause of international peace there should be taught in all secondary schools to all pupils of both sexes the plain outline of the history of Europe from 1789 to 1919, so that they may realize that the doctrine of the Balance of Power, the rise of nationality, competitive armaments, and the absence of any sense of international co-operation led to inevitable catastrophe, like torrents uniting in a cataract to plunge into an abyss, and that the restoration of this system must produce similar results with no chance of recovery. And in Great Britain I would add that an outline of American History should be taught at the end of the school course, for there are few countries about which our children are more completely ignorant, or about which it is more important that they should know. If at the same time the teachers, as they can very rightly and properly do, can point to the fruits of international co-operation, to the probability that the world in the future will largely consist of small political and natural units which rightly prize their racial unity but yet have to live together, to the great benefits which may accrue from the positive activities of the League of Nations, their pupils may be safely left to draw

their own conclusions, and these will be based upon the truth.

Enthusiasts follow an equally dubious policy when they attack with especial acrimony the Junior Contingent of the Officers' Training Corps, maintained in schools, and with less, but still with real, hostility all Cadet Corps, and Boys' Brigades, and organizations which have about them any suspicion of militarism, or suggestion that the use of lethal weapons is taught. The question is best considered with reference to the Officers' Training Corps, where argument rages most strongly. Boys drill at school, and acquire a minimum of military knowledge because it is considered to be still the part of a citizen to be able to defend his country. Boys do not acquire a spirit of militarism thereby, or a desire to go to war: in fact, there are few deterrents more strong than a knowledge of what rifles, machine-guns, and bombs can do. The men who train the boys have no militarism in them as a whole, for they are largely men who have fought in the War. When disarmament is a reality, then the particular form which the work of the Officers' Training Corps takes will become a superfluity, and would cease, though some other activity would need to be substituted in the schools as distinct from games, and could probably be found in some development of Boy Scouting. Until that time comes, it seems not unreasonable, in a country where military service is not compulsory, that boys should learn voluntarily to defend their native land.

It is argued that every school should maintain a Branch of the League of Nations Union, and this is no bad thing, though it is not so easy to do as it seems. Membership should be voluntary, though this is a word which means various things in various schools. The difficulty is to provide such a school society with the subject-matter which it requires for its continuous life. The initial statement of the case is easy, but the recitation of the activities of the League at Geneva, the exhibition of the skeleton organization which enables it to function, are to children a valley of dry bones, through which they are sometimes made to travel too frequently. The Consultative Committee of the World Economic Conference, and the International Labour Bureau leave them cold: how can it be otherwise? It is best to use the meetings of the Branch to teach the children something in an interesting way about other countries and not to make it like the school missionary society, which is often so very good for you, but so very boring. Above all, we do not want the League of Nations to shape itself in the average mind as a dull and remote thing in which one was forced to take interest at school.

There are, in fact, no dodges, no methods by which through education the progress of events can be rapidly forced, if the foundations are to be secure. If the teachers are convinced, they will pass their convictions on to the children, and the education on which the cause of international

peace can be most firmly based is certainly that which is not directed to this specific end, but founded on practical Christianity, culture, and character. Once again, the teachers of Great Britain and the United States, in this as in other directions, can be the most efficient builders of the future. For the United States can provide most of the driving-power which is needed to carry humanity onward, and the British Empire in the form which it has assumed since the War, and in the ideals which it has set before itself to accomplish, can provide an example after the model of which it is possible for the whole world to organize itself.

CHAPTER XIX

"MY MIND TO ME A KINGDOM IS"

THE nineteenth century and most of its watchwords are almost entirely out of date, for it brought upon the world conditions which it never foresaw. It was a great age, and we do foolishly to belittle it, when we produce so few who can stand comparison with its masters. But its political system ended in unavoidable catastrophe, and was bound so to end: its economic system, as inevitably working itself out, has brought the world face to face with conditions which are powerful enough to submerge all the real values of individual life. It has been called mass civilization, if the title is not a contradiction in its terms, a meaningless oxymoron: its character has been described with vivid clearness by M. Lucien Romier in a book entitled *Who will be Master: Europe or America?*, of which a translation has recently been published. Industrial development, he points out, has brought with it a vast increase of population, so that the inhabitants of Europe have in a century trebled in number, and more than a hundred millions dwell in America in regions where a hundred years ago there were only Indian tribes roaming

in vast silences. "This new humanity," he says, "actually created by the new sources of wealth, lives in masses, and can only live in masses. If you alter one of the facts that contribute to the life of the mass, if you suppress the wealth that is being exploited, the aggregation or the unity of the individuals who together exploit this, if you take away their outlet or their profit from the collective activity, everything crumbles, the mass falls in ruins, the surplus population dies off, the children who were to be born fail to see the light of day."

This is true. If the industrial system ceased to be, three-quarters of the inhabitants of the British Isles would have to die off before the social and economic life of the country could regain equilibrium, and whether that position, when reached, would be more happy or less happy than the present, it is certain that the process of attaining to it would be distinctly uncomfortable. We are therefore caught up in the revolution of a machine which we cannot stop, and another of its inevitable results is that, if it does not make the whole world kin, it tends increasingly to make everybody like everybody else. Its effects spread ever more rapidly through Europe and the world. Go to the land where "the mountains look on Marathon, and Marathon looks on the sea," and you will look on men dressed in ready-made suits of factory manufacture, and women showing freely the artificial silk stockings of the industrial system. Go to

Athens, and not far from the theatre of Dionysus you will see an urban audience enjoying an American film. Even the Turk discards his fez, and the unchanging East learns to change, and shows itself a rapid learner. These are outward signs of an inward and non-spiritual process.

Meanwhile the individual suffers hard measure, and in politics he is ceasing to count. The class that should produce men and women of sweetness and light, lies crushed between the upper and nether millstones of capital and labour, the sole real forces necessary to the operation of the system. In Russia they have all been got rid of by the simple process of knocking on the head all those who did not escape into poverty and exile : elsewhere the political process of extinction, though more merciful and more dilatory, is none the less sure. Individuals are to be ground exceeding small. To Mussolini they represent no more than "smoky ideologies," while he seeks to give effect to his own will through the functioning of the economic forces which in the modern State are alone real. In Great Britain the Liberals dwindle and grow beautifully less. We moved fifty years in the War, and in the new age the party which was all-powerful but yesterday was discovered to have little meaning. Capital represented by Conservatism, and Labour represented by Socialism, the mass-forces, emerge as the sole realities in the world which has taken shape after the conflict.

Nor is it at all certain, as many think, that

Socialism, at any rate as it has been hitherto professed and taught, is anything but itself obsolescent. Its economics are at fault, for it looks upon wealth as a fixed and stationary heap, which can be divided out, but wealth to-day depends upon movement, on the circulation of trade, on the promotion of wants and their satisfaction. The process goes on in circles that continue to widen all round the world, and everything that stops the process, be it strike or war or predatory legislation, merely destroys wealth. It is not there when you fight for it, for the wheels have stopped, and on the circulation of those wheels its existence depends. Once this is understood, class war will become unmeaning, for it destroys its own objects. All the members of each economic mass will stand together, will be bound to stand together, and politics in the future will be but the clash or the co-operation of their wills.

Finally, for nine-tenths of the population of such an industrialized society, each man's individual labour becomes wholly uninteresting. This has often been pointed out. It offers to the individual no chance of initiative, no artistry, no opportunity of expressing his own personality. His object is therefore to have done with it, and his interest is merely, how much he is going to get for it. For the amount of his wages, and the leisure he can secure, alone decide how far he can live as an individual and not as an automaton, a servant bound to a machine. Therefore money, and that which money can give, in this

twentieth century of Christianity, count far more than they ever did before: there may be no real values in human life other than the economic, if the industrial system works itself out unguided and unchecked.

Such is the case which now in one aspect, and now in another, is drawn against the industrial system by those who witness its full development, and nowhere more convincingly than in the book to which I have referred. It offers a dark prospect, of which the best thing that can be said is that the system tends to weld men together by compelling ties of self-interest, and transcends the boundaries of nationality. Production, distribution, and consumption are world-wide in range, and the interests of the whole system are that it shall continue to function in stability and peace. At the same time it is, though a natural, yet a profound error, to regard man as an economic unit, and no more. It was this error more than anything else which has brought about the sombre catastrophe of Russia, and delays its recovery, this error which makes men think that Socialism is the whole gospel of man, instead of only a part of the truth. There are certainly some elements in the situation which in the review with which this chapter has opened have been omitted.

There is the striking fact that there are more States in Europe to-day than there were before the War, and that the architects of the Peace Conference had to follow, so far as they could,

the lines of self-determining nationalities. Each race, however small, seeks autonomy, and the air is filled from time to time with the complaints of oppressed or cramped minorities. There is a revival of the languages of small nations, the use of which is palpably a disadvantage in a world ruled by mass-movements: yet the Welsh are proud of their tongue, and the Irish relearn their almost forgotten Gaelic. In the Tyrol the new citizens of Italy protest most bitterly that the free use of their native tongue is forbidden to them in their schools and in public life. Even in America it has been found that Germans and Slavs and Latins are not to be completely absorbed, and that even in the second and third generations they keep reactions which are not wholly American. The urge of nationality remains real, and the great industrial system at its highest power and in its fullest development cannot even in fifty years turn those immigrants into hundred per cent. Americans. Catholics and Jews alike possess a religious faith which refuses to be submerged, though its emphasis may be altered. *Cœlum, non animum, mutant qui trans mare currunt*: religion and nationality defy the unifying influence even of the industrial system in the New World. It is quite recognized, both in Europe and in America, that these prejudices, or, as they should be more rightly called, these instinctive loyalties, do not pay, but they are felt to be the source of all vitality and self-respect. Man still remains not wholly an economic animal, and if the devil

in the guise of the industrial system whispers him in one ear, and in the other his good angel whispers the question, "What shall a man gain if he win the whole world, and lose his own soul?" there is no doubt what the answer of humanity will be.

In the old days, when the barbarians broke the frontiers of civilization, men went out into the solitudes, and sought as hermits to save their souls. In these days, when all the values of European civilization are threatened by mass-production, there seem to be many who have no better advice to give to those who value culture and individuality than that they should withdraw from the wickedness of the world into some solitude of art or philosophy or meditation, despising the world without them, and refusing co-operation. It is bad advice: it is wrong to forget that even a little leaven leavens the lump. There is certainly a middle way which is neither world-affirming nor world-denying, and it is not necessary that anyone, whose life is in part governed by the inexorable sweep of the machinery of the system, should allow the whole of his life to be so governed. It is not necessary to be so practical that one becomes oneself no more than a part of the machine. Only, if that necessity is to cease to press upon the world, there must be a certain measure of liberal education for all, and there must be a certain amount of leisure for all. The industrial system with its marvellous capacity for producing wealth, for setting men

above the reach of famine and scarcity, for producing enough and more than enough, can provide both the education and the leisure: the poison carries with it its own antidote, if we know how to use it. Leisure without education would be a disaster, and education without leisure would be a mockery. If humanity is to set itself free from slavery to materialism, it must claim both education and leisure, and those who stand for the kingdom of the mind must be much more outspoken and much more single-minded than they have been.

There are already in existence associations of those who care for the things of the mind, and who pursue truth, the Academy in France, the Royal Society in England, and many other groupings of those who occupy themselves with Science, and Art and Letters. There are also groupings, less distinguished, of those who concern themselves with education. There is a seedling of the League of Nations, a Committee for Intellectual Co-operation, of which none can say as yet whether it will wither, or whether it will grow until it becomes a rallying-point for the thinkers and artists and educators of the world. It may be the nucleus round which those classes, that have such indispensable gifts to bestow for the saving of the modern world, may form a common mind and a strong policy of principles that shall not be compromised. It is at any rate feasible that, combining first in national groups, and thereafter combining so far as is possible internationally,

they shall unite to fight the influence of "mass civilization" in at least five fields.

First, every endeavour should be made that intellect and art shall not be commercialized. It means a raising of the standard of public taste: it means greater moral courage in resistance to those who control the purse-strings: it means the giving of reward, not necessarily, or even in the first place, financial, to those who earn the admiration of those who know. It might save art from being the battle-ground where those who follow convention because it pays are in conflict with those who outrage convention because it attracts notice: it might save literature from the devastating flood of those who consciously write second-rate and third-rate stuff to catch the attention and to conform to the tastes of second-rate and third-rate minds: it might save intellect from being bought like a commodity in the market, and thinkers from thinking within lines which are laid down for them by influences which have nothing to do with truth, but are ultimately concerned with dividends and vested interests. It would be no bad thing for the world if there were far more people in it who were not afraid for very good reasons to speak out the truth that is in them, if there were far less occasional conformity.

That brings me by natural development to the need for jealously maintaining in all inviolability freedom of speech and freedom of thought. Even in England, that prides itself on being the home

of those priceless possessions, it is not possible to feel entirely comfortable or confident. The unrequited services of Lord Haldane, for instance, leave an unpleasant flavour in the memory, and the temper of those who in one political party admire, and wish that they could imitate, the drastic methods of repression by which the freedom of speech, of the Press, and of political opinion have been caused to disappear in Italy, and of those who in another party do not discourage the systematic breaking-up of the political meetings of their opponents, wherever they have the power to put their wish into effect, forces one to conclude that it is necessary to fight as hard for the sanctity of this principle in a democracy as ever it was under a system of privilege. And in America we cannot forget that University professors have been removed from office for teaching what is accepted doctrine in the educated world, because it was not in accordance with the mind of Tennessee.

A third direction in which the industrial system under which we have to live invades the domain of the intellect with unfavourable results is that it tends to over-specialize and to dehumanize the expert. At times it makes him merely one of the bearings of the industrial machine, a mere instrument of production, for outside his very narrow activity he knows nothing, and it does not pay him to know anything. At times it makes him the unsympathetic official, who carries on his formal round without troubling to know

anything even about the other departments of his own office, let alone the general life of humanity. This is the reason why much that passes for intellectual work in the world to-day is not intellectual work at all, but the veriest hack-work, mere repetition-processes, of which a man has learned the trick in early life, and thereafter learned nothing more. But you cannot know anything really well unless you know something about a good many other things, you cannot otherwise retain any power of growth, or principle of vitality within you. The gulf between the expert and the common man must be less wide than it is at present.

Fourthly, therefore, we must stress individuality in education, individuality of the pupil, of the teacher, of the school. This has been argued at length in earlier passages of this book, and need not detain our attention here. But, if it is passed over lightly, it is not because it is not vitally important, for, indeed, it is the key position of all. If this principle is lost, all is lost, and the industrial system with all the results of mass-production must extend its sway unchecked over the human spirit. Every man shall count for one, said Bentham, and not more than one : that is the maxim of democracy. Every man shall count for one, and not less than one—that is the maxim of education. The whole issue of the development of true human personality lies in that slight change of phrase.

Fifthly, the teaching profession must be united

in a common ideal, which will by no means deny scope to individual variety. They will be a single profession whose bond is *idem sentire de republica*, to have a common attitude to public life, whose aim is to send forth pupils who seek the spiritual values of truth, beauty, and goodness, in freedom, and know that these can neither be given nor denied by money. They will be the servants and the interpreters of the great minds of their own and of former generations: they will hold in their hands the keys of the kingdom in which liberty is not a name, and contentment no will-o'-the-wisp.

If these ideals are true, if these principles are to be acknowledged as the Magna Charta of the kingdom of the mind, there is need for all who would dwell there, to think clearly, to live fearlessly, and to work in unison one with another. The difficult task of retracing steps has in some measure to be attempted, for, as I have attempted to point out, the methods of mass-production have made some headway in our schools both in Europe and in America. It is possible for observers to remark, with more truth in their criticisms than one likes to confess, that the community after half a century of compulsory education remains uneducated, and that it is possible to read and write and do sums, and be spiritually none the better for it. Such critics are fond of pointing out that in the Athenian theatre between two and three thousand years ago there sat an audience, many of whose mem-

bers were probably unable to read and write; certainly few of them had enjoyed a formal education over a term of years. Yet they were able to review masterpieces of the drama, and the small community to which they belonged was able to produce master-dramatists, who gave of their best with no thought save of the truth of their art. To-day you may produce a masterpiece of the greatest dramatist that England or the world has produced, but you will not fill your theatre with the products of our State-maintained education. If you could produce *The Tempest* with a real ship, real water, and a real storm, they would come in their thousands to see how it was done, but not to hear the music of Ariel, or to dream with Prospero. But you will find them, if you search them out, gathered in cinema houses, wallowing in the impossible crimes, the sexual excitations, the lush "close-ups," and the broad "comics" which have been devised, designed, and produced in another continent to amuse and pass away the leisure of another machine-made population. The England of Elizabeth was, like Athens, far smaller than the England of to-day, but it was incomparably greater for the same reason too, that the men of those days were educated by a citizenship felt to be real, they did things in common, and they were lifted up to seek a common ideal. Athens, delivered from Persia, flowered forth in pioneer achievement in architecture and sculpture, history, drama, and philosophy: England delivered

from Spain flowered in the genius of Shakespeare. But Great Britain, delivered from German hegemony, educated but industrialized, flowers forth neither in art, nor music, nor drama, nor thought, nor any form of literature. The crowded Cup-Tie, the throngs gaping and betting on "the dogs," the packed cinema—in these a democracy, which has shown itself in action truly heroic shows itself incapable of accomplishment in the things of the spirit, and proves that its education so-called must have been either wrong or imperfect, a thing of quantity only, and never of quality.

To this the only answer can be, have faith. The education that has so far been given to the people is at most partial and second-best, and has little in common either in range or in spirit with the universal education that may be. It was but the least possible with which the people would be contented, and it was calculated to equip not citizens, but servants. In the light of what has happened it is clear that the true educator must stand fast against all schemes which present education as a process of training individuals in the mass for the service of various parts of the educational machine: they must have a life, and be fit for that life, apart from the machine. They must be able not only to be used by it, but to use it, to be in it, but not of it. This is always the most subtle and insidious line of attack. What is the good of an education which does not make the boy, or the girl, able to

write shorthand accurately, to typewrite quickly, to add rightly ? and if it does these things, how excellent are our schools ? What is the good of an education when a boy cannot be trusted to use tools, or to mind a machine ? and how excellent if he is so well broken in that he can be trusted to lay a piece of paper on, and to take a piece of paper off, the same machine-plate for eight hours each day ? There is not only the pressure from the employer, but it comes from the parent and from the child. I want to learn something which will enable me to earn my own living, which will mean good money. And how natural and irresistibly sensible is this plea. So true is it that the industrial system is always there, the system on which and by which life has to be lived, into which we have to fit : and education has to fit us. Quite true. But education has to fit us for something more, and that something more is so incomparably precious that it will save a man from being a mere unit, a cipher : it will give him a life of his own, independent of the machine. And therefore at any cost our education must never sink to the level at which it will be merely vocational.

For these same reasons it is incumbent on all who educate and all who administer the work of education not to exalt too highly the mechanical or partly mechanical methods by which intellectual performance is judged, and its quality estimated. Like the industrial system itself, which is its real parent, these are a means which we have to

use, but never an end which we have to seek. Equally the modern school tends to be an organization with a time-table, a detailed syllabus, a balanced curriculum, systematized textbooks, card indexes, and teachers' and scholars' records, and all these are good things each in their way, and all of them means to an end, and never an end in themselves. Yet people are always making them so, and when they have built up the whole complicated structure think that they have created a school, and accomplished the whole duty of man as a teacher. So it is not surprising when a Japanese gentleman, coming perhaps all the way from Tokio, calls upon me, and beaming over his spectacles, says in imperfect English, "By what methods do you produce the English Public School spirit?" that he takes out his pocket-book and pencil, and obviously expects me to recite the relevant articles of the code by which this side of our school activity is governed and regulated. We have still a long way to go in this country, and in some other countries there is a still longer road to be trodden, before it is recognized that the most valuable things in education are the most elusive and the most immeasurable.

Individuality, personality—let these be exalted. Let us insistently put before the minds of the children that prophets are greater than priests, and great men greater than the systems which they create. Even if America has made and sold fifty million or billion gramophone records in a

single year, let us make it clear that it is better to be a Mendelssohn, or a Schubert, than the manufacturer of all these. Let us found our religion on a person, on the individual life of Christ, and all that it stands for, both of affirmation and revolt. He did not deny the world, but used it, as we too must learn to use the industrial system and all its works, laying up for ourselves treasure which is neither produced nor consumed, but increases the more, when there are more people to share it with us. And on that basis let us hold up for admiration the great individual figures, a Plato, a Dante, a Shakespeare, a Goethe, and consider the riches which they have bestowed upon humanity, which cannot be used up, and are found ever in more abundance, the more you bring to the search. Let us hold up the achievements of small communities, many of which would be lost in modern London or modern New York, the gifts which were given to the world by Athens or Palestine, by Florence or Venice, by Flanders or Weimar, by the old England or the old France. Few who thronged to the exhibition of Dutch Pictures can have gone away without feeling that there was something in the life lived in that small country under conditions which we should regard as so limiting, which somehow or other we with our large horizons and our command over nature are missing.

This much, further, is certain, that, if we would preserve individuality, and foster the develop-

ment of personality, we must safeguard the family and the home. Here, too, the industrial system is delivering an attack which in some communities has gone far already, though the nature of the disintegrating force is only rarely understood. The industrial system is non-moral, a vast omnipresent influence which is not interested in the production of citizens, but of a sufficiency of economic hands, which offers to men and women in great conglomerations the opportunity of sharing in production and sharing in consumption, of forming material wants and of satisfying them, but does not care whether they are married or unmarried, moral or immoral, unless it should happen to interfere with efficiency of production. So on the whole it favours temperance, because it makes labour more efficient, hospitals and health services for the same reason, and religion because it makes labour more contented. But if the results were different, the industrial system qua system would be in favour of alcohol and atheism. Since this industry has no local ties, and no interest in the family as such, since the family is a handicap in the system under which men and women have to live, since money is equally good everywhere, and there are no real values save those that are economic, it is not an atmosphere which is favourable for men and women to form a spiritual union : it is favourable for them to come together to gratify their own personal wants, and when this gratification ceases, to separate. Those who doubt the reality of this

need only consult the statistics of divorce in some of the states of America: they will find that there is a strange solvent at work.

There are three positions which in the face of this insidious and non-moral power which has gripped our lives must at all costs be defended. They are the supremacy of mind, the tradition of culture, and the institution of the family. And once again I return to my text, and declare that these can alone be safeguarded by a teaching profession which is united by a single ideal, and has the power to base the education which it imparts on religion, discipline, culture, and service.

CHAPTER XX

EUROPE OR AMERICA: OR IS IT EUROPE AND AMERICA?

SINCE America intervened in the Great War, and startled Europe by the magnitude of the material forces which she threw into the scale, and by the speed of their development, the self-satisfied exponents of European philosophies of life have been compelled to take notice of the fact that there is a new power in the world. Since America withdrew from further contact with the unuplifted politics prevalent upon this side of the Atlantic, and settled down to enjoy her own good things, poverty-stricken Europeans have been gazing across at a land of unexampled wealth, fear-stricken Europeans have been watching a land of unexampled security, and the subsequent comments which have been pouring from the Press have been not untinged by asperity and jealousy. Both sides offer plenty of targets to the missiles of the foe, and each has not the slightest doubt of his own moral superiority. America lectures, and Europe mocks and satirizes: it would be more profitable for both if they really tried to understand one another. I, who have never been to the United States, have perhaps no right to offer

comment at all, for my judgments are based on what I have read, and not upon what I have seen. But I believe that the future well-being of the world depends upon the equal collaboration of the British Commonwealth and the United States more than upon any other factor, and that this can be soundly based on the tradition of civilization which is the common inheritance of both. I believe, moreover, that by sharing the same ideals of education both sides can enrich that common inheritance, clear away misapprehensions, and work with mutual understanding in an equal fellowship in which each has elements of value to give to the other. On the other hand, the shafts of wit and the points of satire, which fly so frequently on such little provocation, are of no service at all save as indications of short sight, bad temper and bad manners.

Let us begin by measuring clearly the dimensions of the gulf which separates unregenerate America from unregenerate Europe, and it will be strange if both sides do not appear somewhat ridiculous to the common-sense observer both in their complete satisfaction with themselves and their utter blindness to the good points of their neighbours. I will borrow a humorous description written in the *American Journal of Sociology* (January, 1925), which is quoted in M. Siegfried's book *America Comes of Age*, as a statement of what America thinks of herself: "We are the greatest people on earth. Our government is the best. In religious belief and practice we (the Protestants) are exactly

right, and we are also the best fighters in the world. As a people we are the wisest, politically the most free, and socially the most developed. Other nations may fail and fall: we are safe. Our history is a narrative of the triumph of righteousness among the people. We see these forces working through every generation of our glorious past. Our future growth and success are as certain as the rules of mathematics. Providence is always on our side. The only war we Americans ever lost was when one-third of us was defeated by the other two-thirds. We have been divinely selected in order to save and purify the world through our example. If other nations will only accept our religious and political principles, and our general attitude towards life, they soon will be, no doubt, as happy and prosperous as we."

So may it seem to the average comfortably-off Protestant hundred per cent. American in the Middle West, and now let us see how this same civilization looks to a detached and slightly satirical observer, himself the product of another tradition and race, the Alsatian M. Siegfried, Professor of Political Economy in Paris. America to this observer is a new society of unexampled material prosperity, which is organized to produce things rather than people, and in which output is the only God. Its ideal is Henry Ford, and its gospel is really Fordism, but it professes a worldly Protestantism, in which Christ is neither a mystic nor a rebel nor an apostle of non-resistance, but a leader, a sort of superman, even a booster. It

leaves a trail of materialism even upon Catholicism itself, which, as we all know, has been so singularly free from this taint throughout its history in Europe. It is a geographical expression rather than a nation, for it is sharply divided into areas of conflicting interests, and has received into itself such quantities of foreign elements which it is unable to absorb that it is uncertain whether it can preserve its Anglo-Saxon tradition and its racial ideals. It moreover contains over ten million negroes, who constitute a problem which cannot be solved either in the North or the South, and offer " an abyss into which we can only look with terror." It is not the land of the free, for wherever you turn the typical American is perfectly prepared to sacrifice liberty to prosperity. Though the First Amendment to the American Constitution of 1791 states that " Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof," yet the Fundamentalists of Tennessee make light of it, and the comedy of Dayton is enacted in utter seriousness before the laughter of the world. The German is denied his beer, and the Frenchman his wine, in this land, not of freedom, but of Prohibition, for in the sacred cause of efficiency, output, and good morals, the private life of each individual must submit itself to the regimentation of the majority. Eugenics is another instrument of efficiency, which may reduce the rights of man to their proper place, and the Ku-Klux-Klan is but one of many secret groups which continually spring up and die away

again in this ideal society, but are all of them alike in being the means by which the dominant race and religion strike down or paralyse those whose colour and faith they dislike. The final destiny of this great melting-pot of nationalities is still in suspense, but for the present it can quite safely be asserted that in the material sense it has gained the whole world, and in the spiritual sense quite as definitely lost its own soul.

I cannot quote any passage which has been written in praise of European society, for the European is not naïve, and he has the habit of keeping his presuppositions to himself. But I think that the presuppositions with which a cultured European professor faces the sprawling life of the New World might not altogether unfairly be described in the following sentences. Europeans like myself are the representatives of the only true tradition of civilized life, the latest, rarest, and most refreshing fruit of time. Our religion is Catholic, or, if we have no particular religion, we are Catholic in sympathy: at any rate we keep the spiritual unpolluted by the material. We have the good taste never to let those things mix. We are supreme in Art, and are naturally creative. If at the moment we are not producing anything very much, we may do so at any moment, and at any rate we can talk about it very convincingly. We cannot bear either the process or the result of mass-production, which are equally abhorrent to us: what we make and value has originality and finish, and our best work-

men are craftsmen or artists, and they produce things which last for years. We have a natural lucidity of thought and language, which enables us to pierce through to the reality of things, and never to deceive ourselves with words and phrases. We recognize that we are comparatively poor, but we put wealth in its right place, and remember that Solon was more than the equal of Crœsus. It is indeed true that we have recently almost destroyed ourselves by war, and that this war resulted from our system of competitive nation-states. But we propose to go on with our competitive nation-states, because we have an instinctive feeling that this system, which Americans cannot understand, is yet the source of our individuality and of our vitality. We have inherited it, and are indeed its product, but our origins go far back to Greece and to Rome, and we feel that we are the real gentlemen of the world.

And, on the other hand, the American says: "You are supposed to be Christians, and after close upon twenty centuries of lip-service to that religion you cannot as nations be trusted not to cut your neighbour's throat if you think that he is off his guard, and not looking. We know the sort of people you are, because we have had floods of specimens of every European race trying to take refuge with us for the last fifty years, because the conditions of life at home were intolerable. You fit very well into our slums for which you appear to be born. Your manners are nasty, you are ignorant of hygiene, and most of you do not wash.

Open immorality flourishes in some of your countries, and you perish by phthisis and venereal disease: in others, though you talk of the great Catholic tradition, you are under the heel of the priest, and an uneducated priest at that. Your labour is disloyal, inefficient, and riddled by communism. You are liable to constant revolutions and dictatorships: you destroy one another by incessant, malicious, and murderous wars. You are so jealous of one another that you cannot move freely on your own rivers, nor across your petty frontiers: you strangle your trade because you will not give it scope, and you have only yourselves to thank for the fact that every now and again you die of famine. Can you wonder that every clean-blooded American man, and every pure-minded American mother, thank God that they dwell in a land cut off by a whole ocean from all these enormities, and intend to continue to watch from afar the dreadful end which, as we know from the Bible, God always prepares in the end for the unrighteous?"

Now of course the four points of view which I have set forth are not to be taken too seriously, but they are the sort of thing which Americans and Europeans think of themselves, and the sort of thing which they think of each other, and, what is worse, they are the sort of thing which they say of each other. Particularly is this true of the European intellectual, who is sore on the subject of Reparations, who realizes that most of the money of the world has crossed the Atlantic, and

who discovers, though he will not confess it, that Western Europe is more than half Americanized already. These opposite statements are not statements of truth, but of a passing phase of mind. On the American side much is due to lack of educational opportunity, lack of travel, and the remoteness of Europe: there are many forces active in America to-day which are breaking down this lack of comprehension. It is harder to be as optimistic about the change of mind of the European intellectual, and his feeling of all the superiorities is pandered to by those Americans who have shaken off many of their limitations, and gone to the extreme of admiring all things European just because they are European. It is always hard to let light into the mind of a professor, as St. Paul found at Athens, and even so acute an observer as M. Siegfried who defines the American ideal of service as "the doctrine of an optimistic Pharisee trying to combine success with justice" shows pained surprise when he finds that Americans believe Frenchmen to be cynical. In spite of the Catholic tradition he seems in that definition to have forgotten the Master who was among His disciples as one that serveth, and who was very far from being an optimistic Pharisee. So quick are we to see the motes in our neighbours' eyes, so blind to our limitations. We shall never get on in this way, by picking out our neighbours' human self-deceptions, and calling them hypocrites by contrasting their performance with their ideals, and by dwelling on the weak side of a nation's

character rather than on its strength. Much is to be forgiven to America for being young and simple and too conscious of its own abounding vitality: everything has gone their way, and few heads can stand the utmost good luck thrown in on the top of hard-earned success. Much, too, may be forgiven to Europe for being old and cynical, full of knowledge, but disillusioned. But the most fruitful truth to dwell upon is that all peoples are trying to make the best use that they can of their opportunities, in a world which for most of them is distinctly difficult, and that so far as Europe and America are concerned, each has got a good deal to give to the other, and we must seek the way in which this can best be done because it is the most profitable form of international co-operation for the welfare of the world.

Let us then, instead of exposing and condemning the faults of each other, remembering that the young and newly-self-conscious never forget the sting of satire, and that Europe the publican will always desire to kick America the Pharisee, fix our eyes instead on the good qualities which are certainly to be found if we will spend half the trouble on the search which we devote to less kindly purposes. A century and a half have elapsed since the United States won their independence and asserted the traditional liberty of the race. In that time they have occupied, consolidated, and developed a territory in comparison with which Western Europe is a small peninsula of meagre resources. They have carried their principles from the Atlantic to the

Pacific, and have had the will-power to enforce union and to maintain it. This great work was done in a bare hundred years by men of the Anglo-Saxon stock and of the Protestant tradition. To this they owed their strength, their adaptability, and their standards. The United States of America is by far the greatest achievement of the British stock, though the builders worked in estrangement. That hostility was superficial; beneath lay a strong and subconscious unity between the old country and the new. Since 1880 a rapidly rising tide of immigrants from Austria-Hungary, Russia, the Mediterranean countries, Portugal, and the Balkan Peninsula has flowed in, and poured like a flood into the great cities, avoiding the great open spaces, the conquest of which has made the true America. In a country of a hundred million there are now 36 million foreigners and 10 million "blacks," and the struggle to preserve the racial ideal, and the dominance of the Anglo-Saxon tradition, should command the sympathy of every loyal member of the British Commonwealth. These new-comers are self-invited guests, parasitic upon the prosperity of the United States: they are not submerged nationalities, trodden under the heel of conquest. They can be fairly expected to conform to the standards and values of the country which they have by their own choice made their home. Before we smile at the narrowness and intolerance of the Middle West, its hatred of Catholicism, its distrust of Europe and of the great cities, let us stop to

sympathize with, and to understand, the instinctive repugnance of a great race to seeing the mighty inheritance which they have built up pass into the hands of alien stocks which neither shared, nor were capable of the labours, which created it, and desire only to exploit the fruits. Did not Protestant America succeed where Catholic Spain with all the chances of prior opportunity only wrote failure ? and is not the battle which they are waging for their ideals a battle for our ideals also ?

We must admire America, therefore, for a great achievement in virtue of a great tradition. We cannot withhold our admiration for the manner in which she has shown to the world how man may command the resources of nature : she above all nations has now the power to *do*. Europe is like a man shackled, tied down by a score of bonds, injuring himself in the struggle to be free : America is the same man liberated with certain command of all his limbs. We may make, as we must, many qualifications in our admiration, if this achievement is supposed to be one which can satisfy the higher needs of human nature. But our attitude must be different if we regard it merely as the basis for life, the method of providing those external goods which human life needs, if that life is not for most to be poor, brutish and short. Europe with its small producing areas, its conflicts and rivalries, its inveterate pugnacity, its instinctive separatism, has been wrong, and America with its vast spaces which know no barriers, no fortified frontiers, and

no chance of war, has been right. It may have run the risk of enslaving itself to materialism in the process, but this is no necessary consequence of its victory. If the human race would be set free from scarcity and famine, from poverty and disease, it can be done in the manner which America has shown to the world, nor need we let matter master us because we master matter.

We can admire America because it has an ideal of service to the community which has the power to shape men's lives. We need not be unduly disturbed by the fact that it is always easy to point to many conscious and unconscious hypocrites, who talk of their desire to serve their fellow-men while they re-invest their dividends. Even the Quakers have not been able to avoid laying up treasure on earth, and the high-brows who deny progress, and who sneer at service, are not among those who will ever move mountains. It is easy to cant about service, and it is easy to cant about any principle of our religion : but this is no reason for saying that any principle is wrong. In the ultimate analysis the Christian faith enjoins a duty towards God, and a duty towards our neighbour, and here at the very basis lies that duty of social service upon which the best elements of America have seized as the ideal which has shaped their best public life. To European eyes Americans may seem often extravagant, too often self-deluded, talking a kind of thoughtless patter, or jargon of social service such as passes current in their Rotary Clubs : but Europe will make a profound mistake

if it does not perceive that beneath all this ebullition there is a real force at work, a genuine ideal moving the hearts of men, which will be rich in its fruits for the good of the world.

On the other hand, we in Europe feel that we have elements of supreme value in our tradition, upon which indeed we have no secure hold, but to which we do right to cling, and these are endangered by the conditions which mass-production brings with it. First, let us put the sense of the value of the individual, of individual personality: bound up with this is the instinctive feeling of the worth of home and the family, language and country, which make our best what they are. Shakespeare is for all humanity, but he is what he is because he was born and bred in the heart of Elizabethan England: Dante utters the whole spirit of the Middle Ages, but is the product of the intense life of the small towns of Italy. Both are universal, because both are supremely individual. Abraham Lincoln, the greatest of Americans, has this quality of universality, but he, too, is racy of the soil of his origin. Any one of these three is unthinkable in terms of a system of mass-production, and the same is true of all the greatest figures of the world.

Therefore in Europe we hold to the belief that we must jealously guard all that makes for, and safeguards, the liberty of the mind, that men may think freely, and speak without constraint, the things that seem to them to be true. We respect subjects that do not pay, and honour "useless

knowledge" : we believe that scientists should follow research, as philosophers an argument, wherever it may lead : we hold that Universities should be managed by scholars, even though their administration is an offence to business men : we think that literature and art should be uncensored. We do not believe these things always everywhere and in all circumstances, but in our best moments we know them to be right. We know the difference between craftsmanship and machinery, between the first-class and the second-class. We have therefore a tradition of life, by which the best type of European is able to attain to a certain quality of living, which is individually his own, and not the replica of his neighbour's mode of life. And we believe that, unless all this is protected, further progress will be impossible, for no more great individuals will be produced. The output of genius determines the progress of humanity, and it is possible for genius to remain mute and inglorious if the conditions are unfavourable.

There was a remark once made by a distinguished American which has always stayed in my memory, that European education which began in Universities has always known the meaning of intellectual values, for it has begun at the high level, and percolated down to the low. American education, which has of necessity been based upon the primary school, has never had the same standards, for the proper process has been reversed, and the movement has been from the lowest levels upwards. Those who, having been trained in

Europe, have taught in America, come back always grateful for the kindness with which they have been received, always impressed by what they have seen, but always sensible of something that they have missed. They regret that education is often considered too much to be a record of courses attended, of "credits" obtained, as if the pupil's business were not to learn a subject, but to listen to courses of lectures about it. The utmost trouble is taken over the organization of school education, and it is usually possible to say of any pupil what classes in what subjects he has attended for how many years, and what was the place which he took in the class in each of them in each term. And yet somehow something slips out of reach, and the standard attained by a pupil of similar ability in Europe is not attained by his equal in America. Less organization, less analysis, less checking of the teacher, and less administration might perhaps benefit the process, and improve the results, of teaching. As a result, it is generally thought in Europe that the American undergraduate is a very pleasant person who is devoid of intellectual standards, and anxious to take the course which will cost him least trouble in arriving at the goal which he desires: it is said that the attainments of some of the Rhodes Scholars reflect in a remarkable degree upon the system which has produced them. But those who have known them more intimately have discovered in the young American independence and initiative, and have been able by winning their confidence to call forth

enthusiasm and energy in their work. I cannot speak of my own knowledge, but I am glad to be able to quote from the experience of Mr. Zimmern, who after two years in an American University can write: "It is often said, especially by those who know America only from Europe, that Americans are standardized and all of a type. Nothing could be less true of young America, as I have seen it at Cornell and elsewhere. The Oxford undergraduate is far more homogeneous in outlook, manners, opinions, experiences, and ambitions than the Cornell undergraduate." This is a judgment which those who see in modern America nothing but a materialization of Henry Ford would do well to ponder: it is also arresting to know that in Mr. Zimmern's judgment it is easier in America than in Europe to relate the knowledge of the students to life.

And yet one feels that it must be possible to relate teaching in America more closely to life, and to make the art of those who practise teaching more respected. It is not respected enough, and this is so, as it has been the case in England, not merely because it is comparatively ill-paid, but because teachers seem too much to be passing on a second-hand thing of no particular value. If those who educate can so equip themselves in method and ideals that they seem to pass on something essential for life under the difficult conditions of to-day, so that life to those who have the gift of education is a fuller and a happier thing than to those who lack it, then the status of the teacher will improve,

for he will have a gift which all men desire. It is not so yet in England: it is not so yet in America. Still too much on both sides of the Atlantic is the education of the many the handmaid of the industrial system: still too much does the plain business man, who so often sees no further than the end of his own nose, call the tune because he pays the piper.

Perhaps this is especially so in the case of American Universities, for in Universities the business man is out of place unless he is called in as an adviser on the matters of which he has knowledge. We who know how invaluable the unfettered existence of the great Universities has been to the spiritual welfare of Europe can only look on with distress at the spectacle of Universities managed by business men. One knows that they will produce an annual balance-sheet, statistical records of the courses taken, analyses of the students by origin and destination, comparisons in all respects which can be stated on paper with similar institutions: they will record the deficiencies, or point with pride to the provision of bricks and mortar and equipment. But none of these things makes the life of a University. One knows, too, that sooner or later, to a greater or a less degree, the freedom of the University teacher will be circumscribed, and it will be laid down for him within what limits he shall teach. One has not to look far in the records of modern American Universities to learn that this sort of thing does happen.

It is also worth while to consider whether

America has not borrowed her conceptions of higher education too freely from Germany, with the result that in advanced stages niggling specialization takes the place of the broad outlook upon life, the sense of the true values, which every man and woman needs before they go down into the stresses and materializing processes of modern life. It was natural that she should borrow from the best, or from what seemed the best, but it is never to be forgotten that for the best elements in America, and the best elements in Britain, the rock from which we were hewn, and the pit from which we were digged, are one and the same. It would be natural that the education which is best for the one would also be best for the other. It is because I believe this wholeheartedly that I have ventured to embody in this book this appreciation of America, which can claim none of the merits of first-hand observation. Such unity would not be the result of one borrowing from the other, but of a common ideal based on religion and discipline, working itself out through culture to service and inspiring great Anglo-Saxon communities by all the oceans of the world. Its actual expression would vary, its spirit would be the same: the teachers would be of one mind, and they would constitute one profession the world over. The effect in shaping the future policies of humanity would be decisive.

It has been said that the issue as between Europe and America broadens out until it becomes as it were a dialogue between Ford and Ghandi.

I do not see the issue so. I do not see the future of humanity as that of enslavement to machinery, machine-made men with machine-made wants, satisfied by ever more and more machinery, men who have no souls, but only bellies to be filled. I do not see the future as one in which millions live in dirt and squalor and poverty, while a few hundred have the privilege of rising to a purer air. Does the wisdom of the East outweigh in its intrinsic value the weight of that teeming misery from which it is sprung ? I believe that the future of humanity has room for both elements, and can so win the world that it shall not lose its own soul. But because I believe that this can only be achieved through an education which is fully conscious of the perils which beset modern humanity, and places spiritual values first for all men of all classes, I have written in this book the lessons which seem to have been taught to me by life.

INDEX

Alfred the Great, a pioneer of education, 9
America, United States of, 7
their contribution to the world's future welfare, 284–285
their collaboration with the British Commonwealth, 317–318
various views upon, 318–322
their views on Europe, 322–323
European attitude towards, 323–329
development of, 325–326
education in, 330–334
America Comes of Age, by M. Siegfried, extract from, 318–319
Arnold, Dr., his debt to the English tradition of education, 10–11
his work and influence in the Public Schools, 15–18, 65, 99, 115
Mr. Lytton Strachey's description of, 215–216
Mr. Bertrand Russell's views on, 216–222
Athletics, their value as an educational instrument, 101, 106–109
wrong values placed upon, 140, 142–147
their place in Day Schools, 165
lack of opportunity for in Elementary Schools, 178
Board of Education, attitude of Thring towards, 189
its treatment of elementary and secondary education, 189–190
Boarding Schools, reasons for present prosperity of, 129–133
Bolshevism, checked by education, 171–172
Bowen, Edward, his work in promoting friendly relations between masters and boys, 68–69
quotation from his book, *Essays on a Liberal Education*, 91–92, 200–201
British Commonwealth, its contribution to the world's welfare, 282–285
its co-operation with the United States, 317–318
Brock, Dr., on the misuse of examinations for women, 202–203

Catholics, educational disabilities of, 14
Chapel, the, its part in School life, 22–30, 60, 112
Churchill, Rt. Hon. Winston, extracts from his book, *The World Crisis: the Aftermath*, 280–281, 290–291
Civil Service, necessity for the, 270

Confirmation, opportunities to schoolmasters brought by, 35–40
Co-operation, instinct of, an essential part of education, 276, 279, 282
Corporal punishment, pros and cons of, 72–74
Cricket, its value as a character-builder, 102–103, 146
Curriculum, controversies upon, 82–89, 212–214

Day Schools, relations between old and new, 149–153, 156
advantages and defects of, 157–166
future of, 166–167
Democracy, gives the conception of universal education, 261–262, 268
case against, 262–264, 269
future of, 267–268
its dependence upon education, 275–278
instinct of co-operation essential to success of, 276, 279, 282
Dictatorships, a temporary expedient, 272–274
Disarmament, necessity for, 289–292
Discipline in Schools, its development, 61–71, 138–139, 162–163, 173, 214–215
fundamental principle of, 65
freedom of, 78–79

Education, the basis of world peace, 6–7, 292, 296–297
effect of the Reformation upon, 13
changes in, wrought by Dr. Arnold and others, 15–20
Education, religion the base of, 51, 56–57
its concern with the right use of leisure, 64, 76–77
an ideal national system of, 243–244
its necessity to successful democracy, 7, 261–262, 268, 270
instinct of co-operation an essential part of, 276, 279, 282
Education, Board of, *see* Board of Education
Education Committees, work of, 191–194
Education, Elementary, widespread ignorance concerning, 169–170, 175–176
a civilizing agency, 171
defects of, and some remedies, 179–182
extension of, 182–187, 205
Education, English tradition of, its growth, 3–4
its rôle as Empire builder and world Peacemaker, 5–6
its social scope, 6–7, 236–237
its origin and history, 8–20
religion its most important element, 21
its reliance upon discipline, 61
its culture, 89–94
athletics a part of, 106
its call to service, 120–125, 147–148
its ideal, 195, 210–211, 240, 243
what it is *not*, 210–215
possible results from practice of ideal of, 258–260

Education, Secondary, its limitations, 183, *and see* Day Schools
Elementary Schools, number of, in England, 170–171
religious teaching in, 172–173
discipline in, 173
curriculum in, 176–178
athletics in, 178
England, the Church of, groups in, 49
English, importance of correct speaking of, 131, 185–186
Europe, America's views on, 322–323
conditions in, 329–330
Examination system, effects of, 142, 195–209
Expulsion, necessity for, 74–75

Games, their growth in schools, 69–70
Girls, education of, v, 202–203

Hardy, Thomas, quotation from his book, *Life's Little Ironies*, 113
History, the teaching of, 292–295
Holy Communion, its place in the religious life of schools, 30–34

Individualism, danger from, to educational tradition, 210, 217
creed of, according to Mr. Bertrand Russell, 226–236
its connection with morality, 237–240
Individuality, necessity for preserving, 308–313
Industrial system, effects of the, 299–316

Knowledge, importance of, 248–254
need for, 254–258

League of Nations, its task, 286–289
attitude of schools towards, 296
its Committee for Intellectual Co-operation, 305
Locarno, Treaty of, 290

Nonconformists, educational disabilities of, 14

Officers' Training Corps, argument as to its usefulness, 295

Parliament, discussion on the usefulness of, 263–265
qualities desirable in a Member of, 268–270
Playing-fields, necessity for, 186–187
Preparatory Schools, growth of, 70–71
standards of, 133–135
"Prospects of Democracy," extract from essay on, by Mr. Alfred Zimmern, 266–267

Religion, the foremost element in the ideal of a school, 21, 137–138
five ways of impressing its value upon boys, 22–48
the base of education, 51, 56–57
lack of, in a Day School, 158, 160–162
Rivers, Dr. W. H. R., extract from his book, *Instinct and the Unconscious*, 108

Romier, M. Lucien, extract from his book *Who will be Master : Europe or America ?* 298–299, 302
Rugby Football, its value as a character-builder, 103–104
Rules, their use in schools, 71–72
Russell, Mr. Bertrand, his views on Dr. Arnold, 216–222
his views on the English tradition of education, 223–224
extract from his book *On Education* referring to Individualism, 226–236

Scripture, teaching of in schools, 41–46
Sidney, Sir Philip, 10
Siegfried, Professor, extract from his book, *America Comes of Age*, 318–319
his views on America, 319–321, 324
Socialism, possible obsoleteness of, 300–301
Soviet Russia, government of, 274–275
Stanley, Dean, on Dr. Arnold, 17, 82
Strachey, Mr. Lytton, on Dr. Arnold, 215–216
Superannuation, injustice of, 74

Teachers, a call to, as builders of the future, 59, 297
different types of, 135–137
estrangement between grades of, 153–156
Teachers, their relations with boys, 158–159
an opportunity for, 167
a united profession of, 244–248, 308–309, 316
Thring, the creator of Uppingham, 3
a pioneer of education and social service, 18, 66–68, 115–116
his account of his own school days at Eton, 64
founder of the Headmasters' Conference, 154
his attitude towards the Board of Education, 189
his views on examinations, 198

Voluntary Services, value of, 46–47

Washington, Treaty of, 291
Who will be Master : Europe or America ?, by M. Lucien Romier, extract from, 298–299, 302
William of Wykeham, his purpose in founding Winchester College, 11–12
World Crisis, The : the Aftermath, by Winston Churchill, extracts from, 280–281, 290–291

Zimmern, Mr. Alfred, extract from his essay on "Prospects of Democracy," 266–267
his views on young America, 332

Made and Printed in Great Britain by Butler & Tanner Ltd., Frome and London

THE AENEID OF VIRGIL.

Translated with an Introductory Essay by FRANK RICHARDS, M.A. 15s. net.

'Mr. Richards declines all archaism. He writes partly for the learned, and partly for the general reader. Once more we should like to apply by way of sincere commendation the word "readable" to this Aeneid, and for good reasons.'—*The Times.*

THE EMPLOYMENT AND WELFARE OF JUVENILE.

By O. BOLTON KING. 6s. net.

'One of the most concise enunciations of the activities that are possible and are yet largely to be introduced into this field of education's broad acres.'—*Education.*

"TRAIN UP A CHILD . . ."

By ROBERT BLAKE McVITTIE. Illustrated. 7s. 6d. net.

'An excellent treatise which should be read by all parents, guardians and teachers.'—*Morning Post.*

LIFE OF THOMAS ARNOLD, D.D., HEADMASTER OF RUGBY.

By ARTHUR PENRYN STANLEY. Popular Edition with a Preface by Sir JOSHUA FITCH. With Illustrations. 6s. net.

RECOLLECTIONS AND IMPRESSIONS OF REV. JOHN SMITH,

For Twenty-five Years Assistant Master at Harrow School. By E. D. and G. H. RENDALL. With Portrait and Facsimile Letter. 5s. net.

ARTHUR LIONEL SMITH, MASTER OF BALLIOL.

A Biography and some Reminiscences by his Wife. With Illustrations. 15s. net.

'This extraordinarily living portrait. It should take its place as a classic amongst Oxford books.'—*Outlook.*

ETON AND ELSEWHERE.

By M. D. HILL, late Assistant Master at Eton College. With Illustrations. 12s. net.

'A pleasant record of an active, combative mind always informed by a sincere—even glowing—love of Eton.'—*Times.*

SULLA—THE FORTUNATE: THE GREAT DICTATOR.

By G. P. BAKER. An essay on Politics in the form of an Historical Biography. With Illustrations, Maps, etc. 16s. net.

THE LIFE OF BENJAMIN DISRAELI, EARL OF BEACONSFIELD.

By WILLIAM FLAVELLE MONYPENNY and GEORGE EARLE BUCKLE. New Edition in Two Volumes, revised by GEORGE EARLE BUCKLE. With 16 Photogravures. 21s. net.

Owing to the adoption of very thin, but durable paper, the whole of the letterpress of the original six volumes, including prefaces and appendices, is given within two volumes. Nothing has been omitted except a certain number of the illustrations.

LORD ERNLE, in *The Times*: 'The value of the biography can never be superseded. It must always remain the final authority on the full career of Disraeli.'

THE KINGS OF ENGLAND, 1066-1901.

By the HON. CLIVE BIGHAM, C.M.G., C.B.E., Author of 'The Prime Ministers of Britain, 1721–1924,' etc. 37 Illustrations. 21s. net.

A short account of the lives and characters of the thirty-six sovereigns of England from William the Conqueror to Victoria. The personal histories of the Kings and Queens are illustrated by the occupations, amusements and other incidents of their private lives as well as by the public policy that they pursued, and an appreciation of the character of each one is given drawn from contemporary and later sources. A complete study of exactly this nature has never been attempted hitherto.

OUR AFRICAN WINTER.

By A. CONAN DOYLE. With Frontispiece. Cr. 8vo. 7s. 6d. net.

Sir Arthur visited a large part of the Union, North and South Rhodesia, Kenya, Uganda and Tanganyika during the winter 1928–29. His main purpose was psychic research and exposition, but he has pronounced opinions upon many of the economic and political questions involved. He and his family had also many personal adventures which are here set forth.

ELIZABETH BARRETT BROWNING: LETTERS TO HER SISTER.

Edited by LEONARD HUXLEY, LL.D., Editor of 'Jane Welsh Carlyle: Letters to her Family, 1839–1863,' etc. With Illustrations including two unpublished Portraits. 21s. net.

A series of intimate letters written by Elizabeth Barrett Browning to her sister Henrietta. They extend from Elizabeth's marriage in 1846 almost up to her sister's death in 1860. They supplement the existing correspondence of Mrs. Browning—which contains no letter to either of her sisters.

THE UNEQUAL TREATIES: CHINA AND THE FOREIGNER.

By RODNEY GILBERT, Author of 'What's Wrong with China,' Demy 8vo. 9s. net.

'The Unequal Treaties' is a phrase of denunciation applied, in the jargon of the Chinese agitator, to the whole mass of treaties, agreements and traditions which safeguard foreign residence and trade in China. Their history and purpose are little known abroad, but the reiteration of such phrases, largely of Soviet Russian invention, is slowly convincing the Occident that the treaties, whatever they may be, are iniquitous and hamper China's free development. Mr. Rodney Gilbert reviews China's foreign relations from the early sixteenth century to show how special treaty rights became essential in China, and now remain indispensable to commerce under civilized conditions. His presentation of the Chinese case is scrupulous and exhaustive, but the false premises on which it is based are convincingly demolished; and Mr. Gilbert shows forcefully why the untimely abolition of old safeguards must not only wreck legitimate trade with China, but abet native official exploitation of chaos and of the misery of the Chinese people.

SHORT STUDIES IN SHAKESPEARE.

By G. F. BRADBY, Author of 'About Shakespeare and his Plays,' etc. Crown 8vo. 6s. net.

These studies, ranging from a new examination of the Sonnets to a fresh investigation into the problem of Hamlet, are written from the point of view of a critic who thinks it no service to Shakespeare to find in everything he wrote the consummate expression of consummate art. Shakespeare, as Mr. Bradby effectively proves, could be, on occasion, as careless as he was great—and he is all the more human accordingly. Because of this Shakespeare has left to those who love and study him a variety of problems of literary or psychological interest, which the author here presents, in some cases suggesting solutions and, more particularly. arousing the interest of the reader to study them further for himself, Even on so old and travelled a road Mr. Bradby is throughout a fresh and stimulating guide; and he never forgets in his scholarship the interest of the general love of Shakespeare.

ODDS AND ENDS OF MY LIFE.

By the COUNTESS CAVE, Author of 'Memories of Old Richmond.' With Illustrations. Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d. net.

This little book can perhaps best be likened to an evening talk round the fireside with one who has touched life at many points and is willing to ramble over the fields of reminiscence, grave and gay, with kindly and humorous comment and criticism. Children, dogs, servants, dress, gardens, electioneering; her own childhood and her homes at Richmond and Burnham, as well as her temporary official home in the Lord Chancellor's residence at Westminster; her relations and friends—Lady Cave tells of them all just as if round the fireside. Readers of her former books will know what charm and skill to expect, and they will not be disappointed.

MATTERS THAT MATTER.

By DAME HENRIETTA BARNETT, D.B.E., Author of 'Canon Barnett: His Life, Work and Friends.' With Illustrations. Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d. net.

Dame Henrietta will not make time in the midst of her unceasing philanthropic activities to write her 'Reminiscences,' and her many friends have urged her to collect together a number of the articles she has contributed to the press. As these relate to all the Causes she has most at heart and contain a good deal of autobiographical material and many of her opinions and views, they furnish, in their collected and carefully arranged form, a very clear picture of the career and forceful personality of one of the most remarkable women of the age. The Dame has spent the whole of her long life, from early youth, in successful endeavours to promote schemes to bring education, love and beauty within the reach of all, to level the barriers between class and class, and to unite them in a common desire for progress, spiritual, mental and physical. Few women have seen their daydreams materialize as she has, or when nearing the eighties, could rise as she has done from an attack of influenza and within a month set on foot two new and important associations. The dynamic energy that has enabled her to perform this feat is apparent on every page of this book, and it is also characterized by a strong sense of humour.

THE NARRATIVE OF A NAVAL NOBODY, 1907-1924.

By DOUGLAS FAIRBAIRN, Lieut.-Commander R.N. (retired). With a Preface by 'BARTIMEUS.' Demy 8vo. 10s. 6d. net.

This is a personal account of the experiences of a naval officer throughout his service in the Royal Navy, a most interesting period of 16 years before, during and after the Great War. He is seen in the work and play of life afloat in the Fleet, in peace and war, in many parts of the world where his ships were stationed. With the author we may sail in tropical West Indian seas, or camp on one of the lovely Bermuda Islands. He gives us glimpses of war with the Grand Fleet in the North Sea, and then takes us patrolling, escorting and submarine hunting among the Aegean islands. With him we may stand on the heights of the Acropolis with Athens at our feet, we may see Salonika burning, or wander in the bazaars of Stambul. We can share his thrills of fighting the Turks in Palestine, of being torpedoed and of being mined. These and many another foreign scene are pictured for the reader in these pages.

THE VOYAGE OF THE 'DISCOVERY.'

By CAPTAIN R. F. SCOTT, R.N., C.V.O. Preface by DR. NANSEN, G.C.V.O., D.Sc., F.R.G.S. Cheap Edition in One Volume. With 16 pages of Photogravures and Map. Large Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d. net.

This is a companion volume to the seven and sixpenny edition of 'Scott's Last Expedition,' and is uniform with it in style. It comprises the complete record of the voyage as told by Captain Scott, omitting only the two Appendices of Geological and Zoological Observations.

'The ablest and most interesting record of travel to which the present century has given birth.'—*Spectator.*

C00357732

LA
632
.N6
1930

B1619316

Library
University of Texas
at San Antonio